

**1998  
STATE TRANSPORTATION  
IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

---

**Commission Staff  
Recommendations**

**May 13, 1998**

ROBERT A. WOLF, Chairman  
EDWARD B. SYLVESTER, Vice Chairman  
MARY F. BERGLUND  
P. GREGORY CONLON  
OCTAVIA DIENER  
DAVID W. FLEMING  
ROGER A. KOZBERG  
DANA W. REED

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PETE WILSON  
GOVERNOR



SENATOR QUENTIN L. KOPP, Ex Officio  
ASSEMBLYMAN KEVIN MURRAY, Ex Officio

ROBERT I. REMEN, Executive Director

## CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

1120 N STREET, MS-52  
P.O. BOX 942873  
SACRAMENTO 94273-0001  
FAX (916) 653-2134  
FAX (916) 654-4364  
(916) 654-4245

May 13, 1998

To: Chairman and Commissioners, California Transportation Commission  
James van Loben Sels, Director, California Department of Transportation  
Regional Transportation Planning Agencies and County Transportation Commissions

### 1998 STIP Commission Staff Recommendations

This letter transmits the 1998 STIP Staff Recommendations. As required by law, the recommendations are being made available 20 days prior to STIP adoption.

Under SB 45 (Kopp, 1997), the STIP now consists of a 75% regional program and a 25% interregional program. The regional program is divided by formula into county shares, with each region selecting the projects in its RTIP. The Commission must either accept or reject each RTIP in its entirety.

The 1998 STIP Fund Estimate, adopted in January, identified \$3.260 billion for the regional program and \$1.087 billion for the interregional program (excluding funds restricted to the Federal Transportation Enhancement Activities program). Within the interregional program, the Commission set an early target of \$184 million (4% of new STIP funds) for intercity rail, with the remaining \$903 million for interregional State highways.

At its May 6 meeting, the Commission directed the staff to recommend an expanded interregional program, taking advantage of the capacity freed up by reserves for future STIPs identified in the RTIPs. Advances to the interregional program would be repaid to the regional program in the 2000 STIP. Staff is, therefore, recommending an interregional program augmented by \$17 million (to \$201 million) for intercity rail and by \$100 million (up to \$1.003 billion) for interregional State highways.

Staff has identified five RTIPs with issues remaining to be resolved before they are incorporated into the STIP. For three of these, staff anticipates a simple technical resolution. Staff is withholding recommendation for the remaining two, Los Angeles and Mono, pending further action by the respective regional agencies.

These recommendations will be presented to the Commission at the Commission's June 2 meeting at 12:00 noon, at the Park Place Corporate Auditorium, 3337 Michelson Drive, Irvine, with final action anticipated later that day. If you have any questions regarding these recommendations, please do not hesitate to contact me or David Brewer of Commission staff at (916) 654-4245.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature of Robert I. Remen in dark ink, written over a horizontal line.

ROBERT I. REMEN  
Executive Director

## **1998 STIP STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **California Transportation Commission**

#### **SUMMARY**

The 1998 STIP is a six-year STIP, covering the period from FY 1998-99 through FY 2003-04, serving as a transition from the seven year STIPs of the past to the four-year STIPs of the future. Under the STIP reforms of SB 45 (Kopp, 1997), the STIP now consists of two broad programs, a regional program funded from 75% of new STIP funds, divided by formula among fixed county shares, and an interregional program funded from 25% of new funds. Each regional agency selects the projects to be funded from the county shares in its regional transportation improvement program (RTIP). The Commission must either accept or reject each RTIP in its entirety. The Commission may reject an RTIP only if it finds that the program does not conform to the STIP Guidelines or if it finds that the program is not a cost effective use of State funds.

The 1998 STIP Fund Estimate, adopted in January, identified \$4.623 billion in new programming capacity, including \$276 million restricted to the Federal Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA) program and \$4.347 billion in unrestricted capacity. The latter was subdivided, \$3.260 billion for county shares and \$1.087 billion for the interregional program. Within the interregional program, the Commission set an early target of \$184 million (4% of the STIP) for intercity rail, with the remaining \$903 million for interregional State highways.

At its May 6 meeting, the Commission directed the staff, in preparing its recommendations for the interregional program, to propose projects for advancement against future interregional shares. This can be done by taking advantage of the capacity freed up by reserves for future STIPs identified in the 1998 RTIPs, with the assurance that the advances can be repaid in the 2000 STIP. Staff therefore recommends a program augmented by \$17 million (to \$201 million) for intercity rail and by \$100 million (up to \$1.003 billion) for interregional State highways.

Staff has identified five RTIPs with remaining issues to be resolved before their approval for incorporation into the STIP. For three of these, staff anticipates a simple technical resolution. Staff is withholding recommendation for the remaining two, Los Angeles and Mono, pending further action by the respective regional agencies.

## **1998 STIP STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **California Transportation Commission**

#### **Implementation of SB 45:**

The 1998 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) will be the first STIP adopted since the enactment of SB 45 (Kopp) in 1997. This is to be a six-year STIP, covering the period from Fiscal Year 1998-99 through FY 2003-04, serving as a transition from the seven-year STIPs of the past to the four-year STIPs of the future. The next STIP, the 2000 STIP, the first four-year STIP, will revisit the latter four years of the 1998 STIP, from FY 2000-01 through FY 2003-04. The next STIP adding new program years will be the 2002 STIP, also a four-year program, adding FY 2004-05 and FY 2005-06. The 1998 STIP will also be the first STIP to include and count Caltrans support costs.

As under prior law, the new STIP will include projects carried forward from the prior STIP and projects nominated for new STIP funding by regions and by Caltrans. Under SB 45, however, the STIP now consists of two broad programs, a regional program funded from 75% of new STIP funding and an interregional program funded from 25% of new STIP funding.

The 75% regional program is further subdivided by formula into county shares. County shares are available solely for projects nominated by regions in their regional transportation improvement programs (RTIPs). Under the new law, the California Transportation Commission must accept or reject each RTIP in its entirety. The Commission may reject an RTIP if it finds that the RTIP is not consistent with the Commission's STIP Guidelines or is not a cost-effective expenditure of State funds.

The new law also permits any regional agency with a population of less than 1 million to request an advance against its future county share, with a maximum advance of 200% of the current county share. The Commission may consider such an advance using funds freed up by reserves elsewhere. Any region may propose to reserve all or a portion of its current share for future projects. A decision not to approve a requested advance does not require rejection of an RTIP.

The 25% interregional program is nominated by Caltrans in its Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP). Projects funded from the interregional program are not subject to county shares. The program, however, must meet the following general requirements:

- At least 60% of the interregional program (i.e., 15% of new STIP funds) must be either for projects on the interregional road system outside urbanized areas (over 50,000 population) or on intercity rail anywhere. The interregional road system is a set of State highways defined in statute (Section 164.10-164.20 of the Streets and Highways Code).
- At least 15% of the above amount (i.e. at least 2.25% of new STIP funds) must be for intercity rail projects.
- The remaining funds (i.e., up to 10% of new STIP funds) must be for interregional projects on State highways, intercity rail, grade separations, or mass transit guideways.

- Of the above amount, 60% (at least 6% of new STIP funds) must be expended in the South 13 counties and 40% (at least 4% of new STIP funds) must be expended in the North 45 counties.

The law also permitted regional agencies to include nominations in their RTIPs for interregional road system projects for funding from the 25% interregional program. No agency did so, however.

The Commission may approve or decline to approve any particular project nominated for the interregional program. The final STIP adoption, however, must comply with the general constraints for the program as described above.

### **Fund Estimate:**

The Commission adopted the 1998 STIP Fund Estimate in January 1998, identifying \$4.623 billion in new programming capacity (including Caltrans support costs) for the six-year STIP period. The Fund Estimate identified the following spread across the period (in millions of dollars):

<u>FY 99</u>	<u>FY 00</u>	<u>FY 01</u>	<u>FY 02</u>	<u>FY 03</u>	<u>FY 04</u>	<u>Total</u>
417	403	700	679	1,170	1,254	4,623

The Fund Estimate table of county shares is included in the Appendix to these Recommendations, just before the RTIP Summaries. The table lists the calculation and breakdown of county shares and the interregional program share, including the carryover county minimum deficits carried forward and added to county shares, as required by SB 45.

The table also includes the division of each county share into a portion restricted to the Federal Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA) program and an unrestricted non-TEA share. These county shares are also included at the top of each RTIP Summary included in the Appendix to these Recommendations.

### **STIP Guidelines:**

On January 15, the Commission also adopted the 1998 STIP Guidelines, designated as interim guidelines pending the adoption of permanent guidelines to be adopted by December 31, 1998. These guidelines were designed to carry out legislative intent that the 1998 STIP conform with the requirements of SB 45 to the maximum degree feasible, taking into account the limited time allowed between the enactment of the bill and adoption of the 1998 STIP.

The guidelines include the following major provisions relating to STIP projects and programming:

- Project Study Reports. SB 45 requires that a project have a project study report (PSR) before being included in an RTIP or the ITIP. The guidelines specify that this requirement applies to projects programmed for project development only as well as to projects proposed for right-of-way and construction. The guidelines specifically exempt the programming of project planning, programming and monitoring and the STIP match for CMAQ projects.

- Full funding of project components. SB 45 calls for programming by project components: environmental and permits, plans, specifications, and estimates (design), right-of-way, and construction. The guidelines permit a project to be programmed for some components without being programmed for construction, but require that any component programmed be fully funded. Anything less than a full funding commitment is to be treated as a reserve, not as project programming. This is intended to promote the full use of available funds, since a reserve in one area could free up funds for use elsewhere.
- TEA restrictions. The guidelines specify that the TEA restriction would be spread among the county shares and interregional share. They also permit regions to elect to reduce or eliminate a county's TEA restriction by agreeing to use an equivalent amount of their RSTP funds for TEA-eligible projects.
- Advances and reserves. SB 45 permits advances of county shares (in regions under 1 million population) with funds freed up by reserves. The guidelines define long term reserves (reserved until the next county share period, the 2002 STIP), short term reserves (to be programmed within the next two years), and "reserves for the 2000 STIP." Long term reserves free up funds for county share advances elsewhere. Short term reserves are subject to SB 45's timely use of funds provisions, just as if they were programmed to a project. These provisions are intended to ensure that each county's share is available when needed and, at the same time, to identify funds that can be freed up and put to use elsewhere in the meantime.
- Project eligibility. SB 45 describes STIP projects as capital projects and otherwise defines project eligibility very broadly, particularly for the regional program. The guidelines clarify that capital projects include project development costs and could also include non-capital costs for transportation system management or transportation demand management projects where the regional agency finds the project to be a cost-effective substitute for capital expenditures. The reconstruction of local roads and transit facilities is permitted; maintenance is not.
- Interregional program objectives. The guidelines establish six objectives for the interregional program, including: (1) completing a trunk system of higher standard State highways, usually expressways and freeways; (2) connecting all urbanized areas and gateways to the freeway and expressway system; (3) ensuring a dependable level of service for movement into and through major gateways of statewide significance and ensuring connectivity to key intermodal transfer facilities, seaports, air cargo terminals, and freight distribution facilities; (4) connecting urbanizing centers and high growth areas to the trunk system; (5) linking rural and smaller urban centers to the trunk system; and (6) implementing an intercity passenger rail program (including interregional commuter rail) that complies with Federal and State laws, improves service reliability, decreases running times, and reduces the per-passenger operating subsidy.
- Timely Use of Funds. SB 45 specifies that programmed funds are available for allocation only until the end of the fiscal year for which they are programmed. When allocated, they are

available for expenditure for another two fiscal years. The legislation permits the Commission to extend each of these deadlines one time for up to 20 months if it finds that an unforeseen and extraordinary circumstance beyond the control of the responsible agency has occurred that justifies the extension. The guidelines specify that the timely use of funds provision does not apply to Caltrans support costs, which the Commission does not allocate, or to Caltrans right-of-way costs, which the Commission allocates annually on a lump sum basis rather than by project. The guidelines also specify that, prior to an allocation, a STIP amendment reprogramming funds to a later year will postpone the application of the provision.

- Display of project descriptions and costs. The guidelines modify prior standards for displaying projects to meet the requirements of SB 45. These standards distinguish between Caltrans and non-Caltrans projects because of the difference between them in allocation procedures. All project costs for local agencies are subject to allocation by the Commission, and all allocations are subject to SB 45's timely use of funds provision. For Caltrans projects, as noted above, project support costs are not subject to allocation and right-of-way costs are allocated on a lump sum basis rather than a project basis. For Caltrans projects, only construction costs are subject to the timely use of funds provision.

Specifically, the guidelines call for project costs and program year to be provided for each of the four statutory components for non-Caltrans projects and six components for Caltrans projects. The basic components are (1) environmental studies and permits; (2) preparation of plans, specifications, and estimates; (3) right-of-way, and (4) construction. For non-Caltrans projects, right-of-way engineering and construction engineering costs are part of right-of-way and construction. For Caltrans projects, right-of-way engineering and construction engineering must be identified separately, bringing the total to six components. For Caltrans projects, each component except right-of-way is to be programmed entirely in one year, even if expenditures occur over several years. For non-Caltrans projects, each component may be spread across fiscal years.

- County shares and STIP amendments. The guidelines interpret various provisions of SB 45 regarding the counting of project costs and cost changes against county shares. Generally, SB 45 provides that the amount counted is the amount programmed rather than the amount actually and ultimately expended. The count of right-of-way costs is changed only if the final estimate exceeds 120% of the programmed amount. The count of project development costs is changed only if it varies by 20% or more from the amount programmed. Under the guidelines, the amount counted for non-Caltrans projects is simply the amount the Commission allocates. For Caltrans projects, the amount counted is the amount the Commission allocates for construction and the amount programmed for right-of-way and the support components. To be consistent with the legislation and to avoid the manipulation of county shares, the guidelines do not permit STIP amendments (1) to change Caltrans right-of-way costs, except in conjunction with the annual right-of-way plan; (2) to change Caltrans project development costs, except when the change is 20% or more; or (3) to change the programming of any funds after they are allocated.

## SUMMARY OF CALTRANS AND REGIONAL PROPOSALS

### **Interregional Transportation Improvement Program:**

The Fund Estimate provides a total of \$1.156 billion for the 25% interregional program, including \$69 million in TEA-restricted funds and \$1.087 billion in unrestricted funds. Within this amount, the Commission established an early target of 4% of new STIP funds (about \$184 million) for intercity rail. On March 2, Caltrans submitted an interregional transportation improvement program (ITIP) listing \$903.1 million in interregional program funding for 43 projects on the State highway system. The March 2 submittal proposed to focus the remaining \$184 million primarily on the intercity passenger rail system, with Caltrans to submit specific project proposals after further consultation with the Commission's Committees for Public Transit and Interregional Improvement Project Review.

On April 21, Caltrans published a list of intercity rail projects, which was presented for comment at the May 6 meeting of the Public Transit Committee, listing \$236.5 million in projects, including \$57.5 million for BART's extension to the San Francisco Airport and \$25 million for Metrolink cars and locomotives.

On May 11, Caltrans submitted a revised ITIP submittal for both State highways and intercity rail. Each of the two parts of the program parallels the recommendation of Commission staff and would require an advancement of interregional share using capacity freed up by reserves for future STIPs in the regional program. The revised ITIP includes 50 interregional State highway projects with funding of \$1.003 billion. For intercity rail, it includes (in millions of dollars):

#### INTERCITY RAIL LIST CATEGORIES

<b>Project type</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Maintenance facility and equipment projects	4	\$54.00
Track and signal projects	18	86.82
Station projects	7	19.76
Route extension and grade separation projects	2	40.00
TOTAL	30	\$200.58

### **Regional Transportation Improvement Programs:**

The Fund Estimate provides a total of \$3.467 billion for the 75% regional program, including \$207 million in TEA-restricted funds and \$3.260 billion in unrestricted funds. In the RTIPs, the \$3.260 billion was augmented by \$41.5 million in TEA transfers and \$110.0 million in proposed advances, making a total of \$3.412 billion in unrestricted programming. The TEA funds were freed up by 12 counties that agreed to use an equivalent amount of RSTP (non-STIP) funds for TEA-eligible purposes, as permitted by the STIP guidelines.



Of the \$3.412 billion total, the RTIPs proposed \$3.060 billion for projects and \$351.4 million for reserves. By project category, the projects included (in millions of dollars):

#### RTIP PROJECT CATEGORIES

<b>Project Type</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Planning, programming, and monitoring	\$23.6	0.8%
CMAQ match	32.4	1.1%
Ridesharing/transportation demand mgmt	36.9	1.2%
State highways	2,145.4	70.1%
Rail projects	323.2	10.6%
Non-rail transit	45.4	1.5%
Grade separations (incl Alameda Corridor)	180.4	5.9%
Local road improvements	232.8	7.6%
Local road rehabilitation	40.0	1.3%
<b>TOTAL PROJECTS</b>	<b>\$3,060.3</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

The reserved funds included \$65.2 million for short term reserves (scheduled for programming and allocation to projects within the first two years), \$234.0 million in reserves for programming in the 2000 STIP, and \$52.2 million in long term reserves for programming in the 2002 STIP or beyond.

#### **Reserves:**

The RTIPs identified \$52.2 million in long term reserves for the 2002 STIP and beyond, including \$52.0 million from 4 counties:

- \$17.7 million from Stanislaus,
- \$16.9 million from Humboldt,
- \$10.0 million from Butte, and
- \$7.4 million from Lake.

The RTIPs also identified \$234.0 million in reserves for the 2000 STIP in 37 counties. Of that amount, over 80 percent was in 7 counties:

- \$59.5 million in San Bernardino,
- \$45.8 million in Tulare,
- \$30.0 million in Los Angeles (identified as a rail reserve),
- \$26.6 million in San Joaquin (mostly identified for Interstate 205),
- \$16.2 million for Trinity,
- \$9.7 million in Kings, and
- \$6.0 million in Butte.

#### **County Share Pooling:**

SB 45 and the STIP Guidelines permit regions to pool county shares and, in effect, to loan and borrow shares. There were three instances of such pooling in the 1998 RTIPs:

- Alpine, Amador, and Calaveras Counties agreed to pool their county shares and have submitted a single joint RTIP.

- Stanislaus County is transferring \$10 million of its county share for use in Marin County with “repayment” in the next county share period.
- MTC is using its special authority to pool shares for counties within the San Francisco Bay Area to transfer \$1.8 million from Alameda County to Napa County.

### **County Share Advances Proposed in RTIPs**

The RTIPs submitted on or around March 2 included four projects proposed for advancement of county share:

- Alpine, Amador, and Calaveras County presented a joint 3-county RTIP that proposed an advancement of \$2,994,000 (equivalent to 17% of the combined county share for the 3 counties) for the Angels Camp Bypass in Calaveras County. The project would also receive \$8,189,000 in current county share funding and \$3,183,000 from the interregional program.
- Madera County proposes an advance of \$6,225,000 (56% of the current county share) to complete funding for the extension of the Route 41 Freeway northward to Avenue 12. The current county share would cover \$6,326,000.
- Placer County Transportation Planning Agency proposes an advance of \$11,801,000 (45% of the current county share) to fund improvements on Route 49 in and near Auburn. The current county share would cover \$1,950,000.
- Kern County proposes to advance \$30,158,000 (equal to 25% of the county share) to support \$175 million in programming for the Route 58 Freeway in and near Bakersfield. The current county share would cover \$115,345,000 and the interregional program would contribute \$30,000,000.

Subsequent to March 2, the Commission received three RTIP amendments proposing three additional county share advances:

- Fresno County proposes to advance \$17,590,000 (equal to 26% of the county share) to complete funding for the Route 180 freeway. The original RTIP included \$60,455,000 from the current county share.
- Monterey County proposes to advance \$26,300,000 (equal to 72% of the county share) to complete funding of construction for the Prunedale Bypass. The current county share would cover \$22,900,000. This proposal also commits \$50.3 million from a local sales tax initiative scheduled for November 1998, or other local sources, and requests an additional \$37 million from the 1998 ITIP.
- Ventura County proposes to advance \$14,976,000 (equal to 17% of the county share) to complete funding of the construction of the widening of Route 23 between Route 188 and Route 101. The current county share covers \$24,033,000, which is an amount sufficient only to complete the southbound widening.

**Joint ITIP/RTIP projects:**

There were 22 State highway projects in 21 counties proposed for joint funding from both the regional and interregional programs. These does not include several projects originally proposed in RTIPs and withdrawn when the projects were not included in the ITIP. The projects proposed for funding from both programs are listed in the following table (with dollar amounts in thousands):

STATE HIGHWAY PROJECTS WITH JOINT RTIP/ITIP FUNDING

<b>County</b>	<b>Rte</b>	<b>PPNO</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>RTIP</b>	<b>ITIP</b>
Alameda	80	54K	EB HOV lane extension at Bay Bridge	\$ 3,424	\$ 6,100
Alameda	680	157D	SB ramp metering, HOV lane (Sunol)	14,717	38,000
Calaveras	4	304B	Angels Camp Bypass	11,183	3,183
Butte	70	364A	Marysville-Oroville Fwy rt adoption	3,000	3,000
El Dorado LTC	50	6199	HOV lanes, Sunrise-El Dorado Hills	10,053	15,884
Mendocino	101	125F	Willits Bypass (incr)	17,310	39,167
Merced	99	528D	Fwy conversion, Campus/Healy	17,994	28,297
Monterey	101	58F	Prunedale Bypass (increased funding)	49,200	51,392
Nevada	49	4475A	Placer CL-Wolf/Combie Rd, widen	9,603	11,464
Placer TPA	65	145M	Lincoln Bypass env, design	2,200	750
San Joaquin	205	7965B	Widen to 6 lns, Rt 5-11th St	2,951	2,952
Santa Cruz	17	464	Truck climbing lane	2,000	7,269
Siskiyou	97	244A	Dorris Expressway	9,435	9,435
Solano	37	831D	Route 37/29 interchange	14,000	40,100
Sonoma	101		HOV lanes, Rt 12-Steele Lane	49,600	12,000
Sutter	99		Widen to 4 lanes, Central-Ashford	8,471	1,424
Yuba	65	362A	Third River Bridge	4,500	1,746
Imperial	7	51G	4-lane expressway	33,364	4,052
Kern	58	3455	Freeway, Rt 99-Stockdale Hwy	145,000	30,000
San Bernardino	15	174H	Victorville-Barstow, add NB lane	36,100	29,141
San Diego	905	374K	Otay Mesa, new fwy R/W (incr)	24,000	56,621
San Luis Obispo	46	226A	Expressway, Airport Rd-Shandon	28,218	32,946
				\$496,323	\$424,923

In addition, there were 4 intercity rail projects in 3 counties proposed for joint regional/interregional program funding. These projects are listed in the following table (with dollar amounts in thousands):

INTERCITY RAIL PROJECTS WITH JOINT RTIP/ITIP FUNDING

<b>County</b>	<b>Project Description (RTIP)</b>	<b>RTIP</b>	<b>ITIP</b>
Alameda	Coliseum intercity rail station	\$925	\$3,150
Placer TPA	Auburn, Colfax, Rocklin rail stations	977	640
Placer TPA	Layover facilities & track work	300	1,000
San Luis Obispo	Centralized traffic control point	100	1,000
		\$2,302	\$5,790

**TEA Program:**

Federal Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA) program is given special consideration in State programming because it is likely that the Federal funds restricted to the TEA program would not otherwise be fully utilized. State law does not recognize TEA as a separate program, and TEA funds coming through the STIP are counted in tabulating county and interregional program shares. The Fund Estimate identified \$276 million in TEA revenues over the six-year STIP period, with \$69 million (25%) assigned to the interregional program and \$207 million (75%) divided among county shares.

The STIP Guidelines permitted each region and Caltrans to choose to program all or part of its TEA share initially or choose to wait until the Commission issues further guidance for the TEA program after enactment of a Federal reauthorization act. The guidelines noted that the Commission does not intend to allocate the restricted share funds to TEA projects until Federal reauthorization is enacted and the status of, and possible changes to, the Federal TEA program are clear.

Caltrans, in the ITIP, chose to defer action on the interregional program's \$69 million share. Of the \$207 million available for RTIP programming:

- \$41.5 million was freed up for non-TEA STIP purposes by regions that pledged to use an equal amount of their RSTP funds for TEA-eligible projects.
- \$30.5 million was proposed for specific TEA projects.
- \$135 million remains unprogrammed in TEA reserves.

## RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

### Approval and rejection of RTIPs:

By law, the Commission must include all RTIP projects nominated from the current county share in the STIP unless the Commission takes action to reject the RTIP in its entirety. The Commission may reject an RTIP if it finds that the RTIP is not consistent with the STIP Guidelines or that the RTIP is not a cost-effective expenditure of State funds. The law further provides that the Commission may not reject an RTIP unless it provides notice to the regional agency not later than 60 days after it receives the RTIP.

That 60 day notice was provided to five counties on April 30:

- Glenn. Three projects included in the original Glenn County RTIP do not have approved project study reports. Regional staff indicate that the Glenn County Local Transportation Commission will consider amending the RTIP at the LTC's May 21 meeting to place the \$839,000 programmed for these projects into a short term reserve. Subject to approval of this change, staff recommends approval of the Glenn County RTIP.
- Inyo. The Olancha and Cartago project (environmental only) is underfunded by \$529,000, according to a comparison of programming and fact sheets. Apparently, the \$2.028 million programmed by the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) for this project represented only expenditures through FY 2003-04. Under the STIP Guidelines, a project component must be fully funded and all environmental costs on State highway projects are to be programmed in one fiscal year. CTC staff suggested that the ICLTC could remove the Olancha and Cartago project from the RTIP, shift the funding to the reserve for the 2000 STIP, and add the project back in the 2000 STIP. (The environmental work was not scheduled to begin until FY 2001-02 anyway, according to the RTIP).

In a letter dated May 4, the ICLTC Executive Director advised CTC staff that he was recommending that the project be removed from the RTIP at their May 20 meeting. Subject to approval of this change, Commission staff recommends approval of the Inyo County RTIP.

- Los Angeles. The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) has not yet executed the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Commission under which the LACMTA will agree to submit a funding plan to the Commission by December. The funding plan should address the programming of funds carried forward for rail projects from the 1996 STIP, the funding of rail corridor projects, and the funding of LACMTA's obligations to provide adequate transit service in those areas where rail proposals may be eliminated or prove unfundable for the near term and foreseeable future.

In addition, several RTIP highway projects are underfunded, as noted in the cover letter to LACMTA's April 3 RTIP revisions. In a letter of April 23, LACMTA staff identified a proposed strategy that still does not provide for the commitment of full funding for the Route 2 Roadway Reconfiguration project. The proposed strategy would provide for the full funding of other STIP projects by shifting Proposition C funds, leaving several non-STIP Proposition C projects on State highways underfunded.

Pending action by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority to approve the Memorandum of Understanding and to identify the full funding of STIP projects, staff withholds its recommendation of approval of the Los Angeles County RTIP.

- Mono. The Mono County RTIP programmed over \$20 million, or two-thirds of its regional program, for projects identified as bike lanes, sidewalks, and parking lots, without an explanation of cost effectiveness relative to improvements on Route 395 in Mono County. CTC staff understands that the Mono LTC reconsidered regional funding options at its May 11 meeting and did not amend its RTIP at that time.

At the Commission's May 6 meeting, staff recommended that the RTIP be amended to include \$8.8 million for the Conway Ranch 4-lane project, which Caltrans District 9 had originally advanced as an ITIP project, and that TEA-eligible work in the original RTIP projects be identified so as to take advantage of the TEA-restricted portion of Mono's county share. These actions would require a net reduction of the original RTIP local projects of about \$7.3 million. Pending action by the Mono County Local Transportation Commission, staff withholds its recommendation of approval of the Mono County RTIP.

- San Diego. The full funding plan included in the RTIP for the Mission Valley East Light Rail Transit Project, the Mid-Coast Light Rail Transit project, and the Oceanside-Escondido rail project depends on uncommitted Federal funds. The STIP funds for all three of these projects are grandfathered from the 1996 STIP. Under the 1998 STIP Guidelines, the Commission said it would not program STIP funds (including grandfathered 1996 STIP funds) for projects or project components that are not fully funded. In the April 30 letter, Commission staff suggested to the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) that it might either designate the funds carried forward from the 1996 STIP as a reserve for the 2000 STIP or program some or all of the funds for project components or segments that can be fully funded with committed funds.

Since the April 30 letter, the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) has agreed to amend the RTIP to designate \$6.6 million as programmed for design for the Oceanside-Escondido project. The remaining amount from the 1996 STIP would be designated as a reserve for the 3 projects for the 2000 STIP. With this change, staff recommends approval of the San Diego RTIP.

### **Using Reserves to Support Advances of County and Interregional Shares**

As noted above, the RTIP proposals include, in the aggregate, \$52.2 million in long term reserves for the 2002 STIP and beyond and \$234.0 million in reserves for the 2000 STIP. If we could not anticipate new revenues to support additional programming in the 2000 STIP, only the \$52.2 million in long term advances would be available to support advances in the current STIP against future county shares. The \$234.0 million would need to be held in reserve to assure that the counties holding those reserves would have them available for the 2000 STIP.

Since January, however, it has become clear that the Fund Estimate was conservative and that substantial new funds, especially Federal revenues, will become available over the six-year STIP

period. The Fund Estimate assumed that the upcoming Federal reauthorization bill would provide about an 8% increase in Federal funding over six years, but Congress now appears ready to provide almost a 50% increase in Federal funding the period 1998-2003. Even if a substantial amount of this additional funding goes to programs other than the STIP, the 1998 STIP now seems likely to receive in the range of \$200 to \$400 million more per year from 1999 through 2003 than was shown in the Fund Estimate.

Other indicators that the adopted Fund Estimate is conservative are the balance in the State Highway Account, which stands at \$1.6 billion and is growing faster than was earlier forecast, and the \$200 million reserve for future economic uncertainties included in the Fund Estimate.

With confidence that sufficient new funding capacity will be available for the 2000 STIP, staff recommends that a portion of the \$234.0 million that was identified in reserves for the 2000 STIP be used in the 1998 STIP to program advances against future county shares and against future interregional share. The total of all proposed advances of county shares is \$110.0 million, including a \$26.3 million county share advance for the Route 101 Prunedale Bypass in Monterey County, which would depend on additional interregional funds. Approval of all of these county share advances would utilize all of the \$52.2 million capacity from long term reserves plus \$58.8 million of capacity from the \$234.0 million in reserves for the 2000 STIP.

From the balance of \$175.2 million in reserves for the 2000 STIP, staff recommends that a portion be used to fund additional interregional program projects by making advances against the 25% interregional share. Staff estimates that additional Federal revenues alone should provide at least \$275 million for the interregional program in the 2000 STIP, easily more than enough to repay any advances in the 1998 STIP.

On the other hand, Caltrans needs some programming discretion for the 2000 ITIP, given that the 1998 ITIP would start about a dozen interregional road project that will need about \$750 million to finish from the 2000 and 2002 STIPs. Some of the priority choices among these projects can be made better in the year 2000 than today. Thus, the Commission should be careful, in making advances to the interregional program, to leave adequate discretion for the 2000 STIP. This implies that advance funding is best if it is for projects that would most likely be programmed in the 2000 STIP in any case.

In developing specific recommendations for advancing interregional share funds, staff considered the available pool of candidates. That pool includes projects partially funded in the initial 1998 ITIP and those just below the programming cut-off line that would be candidates for funding from the 2000 STIP for fiscal years 2000-2002. In making its review, staff developed the following guiding principles:

1. Programming in the 1998 STIP should provide some particular advantage, such as:
  - allowing an opportunity for project delivery before the 2000 STIP;
  - shortening project delivery time or reducing overall project cost, or both; or
  - advancing present Commission commitments or clearing the way for new commitments in the 2000 STIP.

2. Programming should minimize added Caltrans delivery workload in the first year or two, given the already heavy STIP delivery challenge.
3. The Commission should consider new information about certain ITIP candidates gained at its April 1 and April 7 STIP hearings and at the May 6 meeting of the Public Transit Committee, particularly including new regional proposals to bring more locally controlled funds to ITIP projects.

### **Project Recommendations for the Interregional Program, Intercity Rail:**

Under SB 45, intercity rail projects are an integral part of the overall interregional program that constitutes 25% of new STIP programming. As described above, the law does establish a minimum portion, equivalent to 2.25% of new STIP funds, that must be programmed for intercity rail. In early consultations with Caltrans, the Commission approved a target of 4% of new funds, or about \$184 million, for intercity rail. For the purpose of that target, the Commission included projects of interregional significance on regionally operated rail systems, including the Metrolink system in Southern California and the BART system in the San Francisco Bay Area.

Caltrans, taking into consideration the intercity rail target and the more general statutory requirements for the interregional program, developed separate project lists for intercity rail and for State highway projects. One list was released publicly in February. Another list, dated April 21, was on the agenda for the Commission's May meeting agenda and was reviewed at the May 6 meeting of the Public Transit Committee. The April 21 list totaled \$236.5 million, including \$25.0 million for Metrolink cars and locomotives and \$57.5 million for additional funding for the BART extension of the San Francisco Airport. On May 11, Caltrans submitted a revised ITIP, which is included in the Appendix to these recommendations.

Staff recommends that the projects on this revised intercity rail project list be included in the 1998 STIP. It includes \$200.6 million in intercity rail projects, using the capacity to advance interregional share to exceed the original \$184 million target by about \$17 million. Specifically, the staff recommendation for intercity rail includes the following changes from the April 21 list considered at the May 6 Public Transit Committee meeting:

- Reduces the 1998 STIP amount for the BART extension from \$57.5 million to \$11.0 million. BART's \$57.5 million proposal is derived from some measure of uncertainty facing the project in regard to contingencies. Although the entire \$57.5 million was included in Caltrans' February preliminary list, as well as the April 21 list, this uncertainty and restrictions on programming speculative contingencies preclude programming the entire \$57.5 million. At the same time, Commission staff is concerned that this project, which is held by the Commission as vital to the State and regional economy, could be jeopardized without demonstrating a readiness to participate in contingencies should they become manifest, making a portion of such costs appropriate to be funded from the economic contingency reservation in the 1998 STIP Fund Estimate. Accordingly, Commission staff recommends that the Commission (1) program \$11.0 million in the 1998 STIP for demonstrated capital requirements, and (2) commit to participate in up to \$46.5 million in additional capital costs, should they become manifest, contingent on local participation and the stipulation that State-controlled funds are not available for purposes of debt service. The means of this



participation should be defined through a memorandum of understanding between BART, MTC, and the Commission, executed concurrent with the adoption of the 1998 STIP.

- Increases the 1998 STIP amount for the Metrolink cars and locomotives from \$25.0 million to \$35.0 million. This project was originally nominated for \$49.7 million on Caltrans' February 1998 preliminary list and was reduced to \$25 million on the April 21 list. The Public Transit Committee heard at its May 6 meeting that increasing the programmed amount by \$10 million to \$35 million would enable the SCRRA to negotiate a lower cost per vehicle, alleviate expected capacity problems, keep pace with increasing ridership, and potentially provide new service on the Riverside-Fullerton-Los Angeles line.
- Adds \$580,000 in 1998 STIP funding for a project to construct parking spaces for 150 automobiles, 4 to 6 buses, and 50 bicycles at the Davis Amtrak Station. This project was originally nominated in Caltrans' February 1998 preliminary list and deleted from the April 21 list. The Public Transit Committee heard at its May 6 meeting that Davis is contributing \$293,000 in local funds to the project, that the station is the fourth busiest of 14 stations on the Capitol Corridor and has only 40 parking spaces, and that the project is in its final phase and can be delivered before 2000.

#### **Project Recommendations for the Interregional Program, State Highways:**

Staff recommends that the full \$1.003 billion program of State highway projects for the interregional program, as presented in the revised Caltrans ITIP submittal of May 11, be included in the 1998 STIP. Staff recommends this action, subject to Caltrans' review of project cost contributions by the interregional program, the regional program, and non-STIP sources. In some cases, the regional contributions listed in the ITIP may not match the amounts listed in the RTIP.

Staff also notes that, for most jointly-funded projects, neither the region nor Caltrans has provided a cost-sharing breakdown by component. Staff recommends that the cost-sharing ratio be the same for all cost components, unless otherwise proposed by both Caltrans and the region.

In its original March 2 ITIP submittal, Caltrans identified four projects for which it proposed a fixed interregional program contribution. For all other jointly-funded projects, Caltrans recommended that any changes to the programmed costs be distributed among the funding sources in the same proportion as the original 1998 STIP programming. Commission staff concurs in this recommendation. The four projects are: the widening of Route 680 near the Sunol Grade in Alameda and Contra Costa counties; the Angels Camp Bypass in Calaveras County; the Route 58 Freeway in Kern County; and the reserve for a tunnel project near Devil's Slide, San Mateo County.

The staff recommendation, coinciding with the May 11 revised Caltrans ITIP submittal, adds the following State highway projects and project components to the original March 2 ITIP submittal, a total of \$100,183,000, drawing on the capacity to advance interregional share using capacity freed up by reserves for future STIPs identified in the RTIPs.

- \$3,000,000 to construct the Santa Barbara 101/154 interchange near Buellton. This project was included in the Caltrans February 1998 preliminary list but was not included in the March

2 submittal. The project includes a commitment of \$5.7 million in local funding from the Santa Barbara County sales tax measure. It is almost designed and will be ready for construction in FY 1998-99.

- \$1,200,000 toward environmental studies for Route 101 reversible lanes in Marin County. This will be augmented by up to \$10 million committed by MTC in a recent amendment to its 1998 RTIP to complete design and right-of-way acquisition, to get the project shelf-ready for the 2000 STIP.
- \$1,242,000 for design work on the Route 41 expressway in southern Fresno County, making the project shelf-ready. This complements Fresno Measure C local sales tax funding already expended for environmental work. This project was included in the Caltrans' February 1998 preliminary list but was not included in the March 2 submittal.
- \$10,346,000 to construct Route 605 high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes in Orange County. This project was included in the Caltrans' February 1998 preliminary list but was not included in the March 2 submittal. This closes a 2-mile gap in HOV lanes built with Los Angeles County sales tax funds where the HOV lanes cross through a corner of Orange County. The project can be constructed in 2002 if started in 1998.
- \$7,394,000 to construct an auxiliary lane on the Route 105 Freeway near the Los Angeles International Airport. This project was included in the Caltrans February 1998 preliminary list but was not included in the March 2 submittal. This project would move existing congestion out of the Route 105 Freeway main lanes and fulfill a Caltrans commitment for improvements at the Sepulveda Boulevard interchange. It is deliverable by 2002.
- \$10,853,000 to acquire right-of-way for Route 91 HOV lanes in Orange and Riverside Counties and to construct the part of the HOV lanes in Orange County. This project was included in the Caltrans' February 1998 preliminary list but was not included in the March 2 submittal. By funding the Orange County segment of this two-county project, it can be readied for construction by 1999, yielding benefits independent of the adjacent segment in Riverside County.
- \$37,007,000 to complete construction of the Monterey-101 Prunedale Bypass, in addition to the \$14,385,000 for project development and right-of-way that was included in the March 2 ITIP submittal. This interregional program funding would complement \$49,200,000 in regional program funding in the 1998 STIP, including \$22,900,000 from the current county share and an advance of \$26,300,000. In addition, the funding package includes a commitment of \$50,300,000 from a local sales tax initiative scheduled for November 1998 or from other local funding.
- \$29,141,000 to acquire right-of-way and complete construction of the northbound widening of Route 15 between Victorville and Barstow in San Bernardino County, in addition to the \$4,566,000 for environmental and design work that was included in the March 2 ITIP submittal. This additional interregional funding would complement \$36,100,000 in county share funding that San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) has agreed to amend

into its RTIP (reducing its reserve for the 2000 STIP from \$95.6 million to \$59.5 million). SANBAG has indicated its intent that the designation of Federal demonstration funds or a contribution from the State of Nevada for the project would reduce its county share contribution. Commission staff notes that the House version of the Federal reauthorization bill is replete with demonstration projects that may or may not affect county shares. SANBAG's intent may prove to be inconsistent with State and Federal law. This is part of a broader programming issue that the Commission may need to address, depending on the language in the final Federal reauthorization act.

### **Spread by Fiscal Year:**

After considering a report from staff comparing RTIP and ITIP proposals with the Fund Estimate the Commission directed that projects in the 1998 STIP not be respread by fiscal year to match the spread in the Fund Estimate. The staff report noted, while programming may exceed the Fund Estimate for the new STIP's first two years, two major factors minimize any risk involved in front-loading the STIP. The first is that the balance in the State Highway Account is \$1.6 billion and growing faster than previously forecast. The other is that it is now clear that the Federal reauthorization bill will provide far more revenue in future years than was forecast in the Fund Estimate, assuring that new program capacity will be added in the 2000 STIP.

### **Commitments for Future Programming:**

SB 45 and the STIP Guidelines permit the sequential programming of project components: environmental, design, right-of-way, and construction. That is, earlier components may be programmed without programming right-of-way acquisition or construction. Right-of-way may be programmed without programming construction. Indeed, as the STIP becomes a four-year document, this should become the rule, especially for larger projects. In part, this STIP reform is designed to permit exploratory studies without a full commitment to construction costs for a particular alternative. At the same time, however, investment in environmental studies and especially in design and right-of-way inevitably implies future programming priority. The Commission needs to focus some attention on such programming, especially within the interregional program, to insure that the number of projects in the pipeline is reasonable relative to anticipated future program capacity for construction.

The 1998 STIP staff recommendation includes \$107 million to bring 9 interregional highway projects through right-of-way acquisition. The estimated cost to complete construction for these projects is \$374 million. These are projects that should be deliverable and fundable no later than the 2002 STIP, the next time new program years are added. These projects, with estimated construction cost, include:

- San Diego, Route 905 Freeway at Otay Mesa, \$92 million.
- San Bernardino, Route 58 widening near Hinkley, \$87 million.
- San Joaquin, Route 205 near Tracy, \$48 million.
- Marin, Route 101 reversible HOV lanes near San Rafael, \$35 million.
- San Benito, Route 156 near San Juan Bautista, \$27 million.
- Monterey, Route 156, near Castroville, \$27 million.

- Madera, Route 99, near Fairmead, \$26 million.
- Calaveras, Route 4, Angels Camp Bypass, \$20 million.
- Inyo, Route 395 at Independence, \$12 million.

The commitment to the Otay Mesa project is particularly significant because it is a part of the Commission's commitment, originally made with the adoption of the 1996 STIP, to fund a series of NAFTA-related projects within San Diego and Imperial Counties, both through the STIP and seeking special Federal funding as appropriate. The Commission staff understands that it is the Commission's intent to assure future funding progress on NAFTA-related projects, including Route 905, utilizing either special border-related provisions that may included in the Federal reauthorization act or STIP funding from the regional or interregional program.

The 1998 STIP staff recommendation includes another \$10 million to complete design work for 4 interregional projects, with an estimated completion cost of \$266 million. These projects, with estimated cost to complete right-of-way and construction, include:

- Yuba/Sutter, Route 65, Third Feather River Bridge, \$178 million.
- Sutter/Yuba, Route 70, North of East Nicolaus, \$50 million.
- Riverside, Route 91 at Corona, \$28 million.
- Fresno, Route 41 near Easton, \$10 million.

Together, these 13 projects represent a total of about \$640 million in remaining future costs for projects committed through design, a significant amount but well within anticipated program levels through the 2002 STIP. Five other projects are recommended for the 1998 STIP for environmental work only, two that are reasonably well defined and three that are more expensive or less well defined and further away from potential delivery. They include (with estimated completion costs):

- Solano, Route 80 widening near Vacaville, \$41 million.
- San Bernardino, Route 58, Kramer Junction, \$90 million.
- Santa Clara, Route 152, \$250 million.
- Yuba/Butte, Route 70 Marysville Bypass, \$375 million.
- Placer, Route 65 Lincoln Bypass, no Caltrans estimate available.

The summary above is limited to the interregional program only. The regional programs are moving in the same direction, toward more programming of project components sequentially, though Commission staff has only very incomplete data on costs to complete the projects proposed through the RTIPs. Staff has identified 28 projects (14 on State highways, 14 on local facilities) from 20 RTIPs that are programmed for \$60 million without project construction. Of those 28 projects, 9 projects (including 7 on State highways) that are programmed for \$35 million are projected to cost \$134 million to complete. For the remaining 19 projects programmed for \$25 million, the RTIPs did not provide costs to complete.

## SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

**Summary Totals.** In summary, these staff recommendations include:

\$3.060 billion	in project funding from county shares
<u>1.204 billion</u>	in project funding from the interregional share
\$4.264 billion	in total project funding (non-TEA)
<u>.031 billion</u>	in project funding from TEA county shares
\$4.295 billion	in total project funding
\$ 52 million	in county share long term reserves (2002 STIP or beyond)
234 million	in county share reserves for 2000 STIP programming
<u>65 million</u>	in county share short term reserves
\$ 351 million	in total county share reserves (non-TEA)
\$ 110 million	in advances against future county shares
<u>117 million</u>	in advances against future interregional share
\$ 227 million	in total advances against future shares
\$ 135 million	in unprogrammed TEA reserves (regional)
<u>69 million</u>	in unprogrammed TEA reserves (interregional)
\$ 204 million	in unprogrammed TEA reserves (total)

Deducting the \$65 million in short term reserves from the \$351 million in total county share reserves leaves \$286 million in reserves for future STIPs. That is enough to support the \$227 million in total advances against future shares and still leave \$59 million in unprogrammed reserves, based on the 1998 STIP Fund Estimate. Staff recommends this as a prudent reserve to support STIP amendments over the next two years that may need to draw upon individual county share reserves for the 2000 STIP.

**Regional Program.** The \$3.060 billion in project funding from regional program county shares includes:

- \$2.965 billion for projects included in the RTIPs and listed in the RTIP summaries in the Appendix, including \$51.2 million in county share advances as proposed for 4 projects in RTIPs submitted on or around March 2, and with approval of the RTIPs for San Diego, Glenn, Mono, Inyo, and Los Angeles subject to specified conditions;
- \$58.9 million in county share advances for 3 additional projects, as proposed in RTIP amendments submitted subsequent to March 2 in Fresno, Monterey, and Ventura counties, as noted above; and
- \$36.1 million in additional county share funding from a San Bernardino RTIP amendment, to match interregional funding for the northbound Route 15 project, as noted in the Recommendations for the Interregional Program, State Highways.

**Interregional Program.** The \$1.204 billion in project funding from the interregional program includes:

- \$1.003 billion for State highway projects, as listed in Caltrans' revised ITIP submittal of May 11; and
- \$200.6 million for intercity rail projects, as listed in Caltrans' revised ITIP submittal of May 11.

The staff recommendation for the interregional program would meet all of the applicable statutory minimums. Of the \$1.204 billion total recommended interregional program:

- \$804 million (66.8%) is for interregional roads in nonurbanized areas or for intercity rail, compared with a minimum of 60% of the interregional program.
- \$201 million (16.7%) is for intercity rail, including grade separations, compared with a minimum of 9% (15% of 60% of the interregional program).
- \$584 million (48.5%) is in the North, compared with a minimum of 16% (40% of 40% of the interregional program).
- \$619 million (51.5%) is in the South, compared with a minimum of 24% (60% of 40% of the interregional program).

**Summary by Project Category.** The projects included in the staff recommendations include (in millions of dollars):

1998 STIP STAFF RECOMMENDATION  
SUMMARY OF PROJECT CATEGORIES

<b>Project Type</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
RTIP share of joint RTIP/ITIP State hwys	\$496.3	11.6%
ITIP share of joint RTIP/ITIP State hwys	424.9	10.0%
RTIP, State highways	1,649.1	38.7%
ITIP, State highways	578.4	13.6%
Subtotal, State highways	\$3,148.7	73.8%
RTIP, rail projects	\$323.2	7.6%
ITIP, rail projects	171.6	4.0%
RTIP, grade separations (incl Alameda Corridor)	180.4	4.2%
ITIP, grade separations	29.0	0.7%
Subtotal, rail and grade separations	704.2	16.5%
Planning, programming, and monitoring	23.6	0.6%
CMAQ match	32.4	0.8%
Ridesharing, transportation demand mgmt	36.9	0.9%
Non rail transit	45.4	1.1%
Local road improvements	232.8	5.5%
Local road rehabilitation	40.0	0.9%
TOTAL PROJECTS	\$4,264.2	100.0%

**ITIP AND RTIP SUMMARY TABLES**

The tables on the following pages are included with these recommendations for information and reference. They include:

1. **1998 STIP Fund Estimate County Shares (one page)**. This table from the adopted Fund Estimate shows the calculation of county shares and the interregional share, including both TEA-restricted and non-TEA restricted shares. The county share calculations include prior period county minimum deficits calculated in January as under prior law and carried forward. The Commission will make a final recalculation of the prior period county minimum deficits after June 30, 1998 and the county shares will be adjusted accordingly for the 2000 STIP.
2. **1998 ITIP – Interregional Rail Projects, May 11, 1998 (one page)**. This list of intercity rail projects is from the Caltrans Revised Interregional Transportation Improvement Program Submittal of May 11, 1998.
3. **1998 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (3 pages)**. This list of interregional program State highway projects is from the Caltrans Revised Interregional Transportation Improvement Program Submittal of May 11, 1998.
4. **Summary of 1998 RTIP Projects (61 pages)**. This set of county sheets, prepared by Commission staff, summarizes the projects and reserves proposed in the RTIP for each county (including the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, which has its own county share). At the top of each county sheet is the total county share, the TEA share, and the unrestricted county share. The RTIP proposals for the TEA and non-TEA shares are listed separately and reconciled to the Fund Estimate share. For each project, the county sheet lists the amount programmed for each fiscal year and for each project component. For Caltrans projects, right-of-way engineering and construction engineering are separated from right-of-way and construction capital outlay costs. For most counties, notes at the bottom of the county sheet provide further information.

**1998 STIP FUND ESTIMATE COUNTY SHARES - SUBJECT TO CHANGE**  
**Carryover Deficits Include STIP Amendments and Votes through January, 1998**  
(\$1,000's)

Transition Deficit, per Sec 182.5(d) - Subject To Revision Through June 1998								1998 STIP					
	1997-2001 Period				2001-05 Period			County Share Calculation					
County	Deficit Carryover	County Minimum	Amount Prog/Voted	Net Deficit	County Minimum	Amount Prog/Voted	Cumulative Deficit	Sec 182.5(f) Adjustment	Formula Distribution	Total County Share	TEA Restricted	Non-TEA Share	
Alameda	0	63,033	40,256	22,777	377	0	23,154	40,000	103,505	166,659	7,639	159,020	
Alpine	336	1,758	1,386	707	11	0	718		2,887	3,605	213	3,392	
Amador/Calaveras	0	8,580	13,582	0	51	0	51		14,090	14,141	1,040	13,101	
Butte	21,367	12,151	32,983	536	73	0	608		19,954	20,562	1,473	19,089	
Colusa	0	3,117	2,604	513	19	0	532		5,119	5,651	378	5,274	
Contra Costa	0	39,266	6,464	32,802	235	5,836	27,201		64,478	91,679	4,759	86,920	
Del Norte	1,426	2,977	11,675	0	18	0	18		4,889	4,906	361	4,546	
El Dorado LTC	896	7,195	13,031	0	43	0	43		11,814	11,857	872	10,985	
Fresno	0	41,462	59,700	0	248	0	248		68,085	68,332	5,025	63,308	
Glenn	0	3,415	0	3,415	20	0	3,435		5,607	9,043	414	8,629	
Humboldt	0	12,431	1,311	11,120	74	0	11,194		20,413	31,607	1,507	30,100	
Kings	0	7,896	390	7,506	47	0	7,553		12,965	20,518	957	19,561	
Lake	0	5,127	1,915	3,212	31	0	3,243		8,419	11,662	621	11,041	
Lassen	0	7,500	0	7,500	45	0	7,544		12,315	19,860	909	18,951	
Madera	0	6,775	16,500	0	41	0	41		11,125	11,166	821	10,345	
Marin	10,042	12,990	31,096	0	78	0	78		21,331	21,409	1,574	19,834	
Mariposa	809	2,524	4,568	0	15	0	15		4,145	4,160	306	3,854	
Mendocino	0	11,587	67,962	0	69	0	69		19,027	19,096	1,404	17,692	
Merced	0	13,460	29,570	0	80	0	80		22,103	22,184	1,631	20,552	
Modoc	0	4,114	0	4,114	25	0	4,139		6,756	10,895	499	10,396	
Monterey	15,339	22,300	92,379	0	133	0	133		36,619	36,752	2,703	34,049	
Napa	9,415	7,399	30,021	0	44	0	44		12,150	12,194	897	11,298	
Nevada	0	6,289	20,200	0	38	0	38		10,327	10,365	762	9,603	
Placer TPA	0	10,183	750	9,433	61	0	9,494		16,722	26,216	1,234	24,982	
Plumas	0	4,670	1,473	3,197	28	0	3,225		7,668	10,893	566	10,327	
Sacramento	92,969	52,518	135,703	9,785	314	0	10,099		86,239	96,338	6,365	89,973	
San Benito	0	3,724	2,187	1,537	22	0	1,560		6,116	7,675	451	7,224	
San Francisco	0	33,938	37,782	0	203	0	203		55,729	55,932	4,113	51,819	
San Joaquin	3,113	27,520	6,994	23,639	165	0	23,804		45,189	68,993	3,335	65,658	
San Mateo	0	34,306	57,582	0	205	0	205		56,334	56,539	4,158	52,381	
Santa Clara	0	74,091	108,249	0	443	0	443		121,664	122,107	8,979	113,128	
Santa Cruz	0	13,110	8,496	4,614	78	0	4,692		21,528	26,220	1,589	24,631	
Shasta	0	13,217	0	13,217	79	0	13,296		21,703	34,999	1,602	33,397	
Sierra	0	2,167	0	2,167	13	0	2,180		3,558	5,738	263	5,475	
Siskiyou	0	9,218	2,701	6,517	55	0	6,572		15,136	21,708	1,117	20,591	
Solano	10,698	18,900	46,221	0	113	0	113		31,036	31,149	2,291	28,858	
Sonoma	0	22,843	2,885	19,958	137	0	20,094		37,510	57,604	2,768	54,836	
Stanislaus	0	20,767	0	20,767	124	0	20,891		34,101	54,992	2,517	52,476	
Sutter	0	4,683	3,351	1,332	28	0	1,360		7,690	9,050	568	8,483	
Tahoe RPA	0	3,121	0	3,121	19	0	3,140		5,126	8,266	378	7,887	
Tehama	1,753	6,543	6,636	1,660	39	0	1,699		10,744	12,444	793	11,651	
Trinity	4,867	4,752	0	9,619	28	0	9,648		7,804	17,452	576	16,876	
Tuolumne	0	5,403	33,278	0	32	0	32		8,872	8,905	655	8,250	
Yolo	0	10,174	8,166	2,008	61	0	2,068		16,706	18,774	1,233	17,541	
Yuba	96	4,007	35,958	0	24	0	24		6,580	6,604	486	6,118	
Discretionary		292,802			1,751								
NORTH	173,126	976,005	976,005	226,772	5,836	5,836	225,022	40,000	1,121,878	1,386,900	82,800	1,304,100	
Imperial	0	14,563	64,102	0	7,615	40,115	0		35,705	35,705	2,341	33,364	
Inyo	0	12,330	17,917	0	6,448	2,798	3,650		30,229	33,878	1,982	31,897	
Kern	0	40,990	81,039	0	21,435	0	21,435		100,498	121,933	6,588	115,345	
Los Angeles	0	301,066	353,589	0	157,438	356,790	0		738,137	738,137	48,388	689,749	
Mono	0	9,033	3,612	5,421	4,724	0	10,145		22,147	32,292	1,452	30,840	
Orange	34,291	81,906	155,740	0	42,831	23,342	19,489		200,812	220,302	13,164	207,137	
Riverside	0	56,118	98,051	0	29,346	19,828	9,518		137,587	147,105	9,019	138,086	
San Bernardino	0	77,671	54,511	23,160	40,617	0	63,776		190,429	254,205	12,483	241,721	
San Diego	0	94,443	114,129	0	49,388	134,416	0		231,551	231,551	15,179	216,372	
San Luis Obispo	0	16,889	4,918	11,971	8,832	0	20,802		41,407	62,209	2,714	59,494	
Santa Barbara	28,144	19,896	50,071	0	10,404	0	10,404		48,780	59,184	3,198	55,986	
Tulare	30,672	19,453	79,355	0	10,173	0	10,173		47,694	57,867	3,127	54,741	
Ventura	0	28,402	26,908	1,494	14,852	0	16,347		69,635	85,982	4,565	81,417	
Discretionary		331,183			173,187								
SOUTH	93,107	1,103,942	1,103,942	42,046	577,289	577,289	185,739	0	1,894,611	2,080,350	124,200	1,956,150	
Statewide	266,233	2,079,947	2,079,947	268,818	583,125	583,125	410,761	40,000	3,016,489	3,467,250	207,000	3,260,250	
Interregional Program (25%)											1,155,750	69,000	1,086,750
Interregional Roads & Intercity Rail (15%)											693,450	41,400	652,050
Intercity Rail Minimum (2.25%)											104,018		
North Interregional (4%)											184,920	11,040	173,880
South Interregional (6%)											277,380	16,560	260,820
Statewide, Available for New Programming											4,623,000	276,000	4,347,000



# 1998 ITIP - Interregional Rail Projects

May 7, 1998

(\$ in millions)

Item Number	District	North/ South	County	Route	SPI	General Location	Description	First Year of Construction	Grand Total	Amtrak Funds	Local, Railroad, Federal & Regional Funds	Other State Funds	Future Funding	1998 ITIP Funds
<b>MAINTENANCE FACILITY AND EQUIPMENT PROJECTS</b>														
1	4	N	Alameda	Capitol/ San Joaquin	R540SB	Oakland - 3rd & Adeline Streets	New Oakland Maintenance Facility	98	\$42.02	\$13.09		\$18.93		\$10.00
2	7/8/12	S	5 Counties	Metrolink	R705SA	Metrolink System	Metrolink Cars and Locomotives	99	\$62.00		\$6.15	\$6.15	\$14.70	\$35.00
3	7	S	Los Angeles	San Diegoan	R667SA	Between Redondo Junction & Mission Tower	New LA Service and Inspection Facility	99	\$13.90	\$6.90				\$7.00
4	11	S	San Diego	San Diegoan	R558SA	San Diego - final site to be determined	New San Diego Maintenance Facility - PS&E	98	\$2.00					\$2.00
<b>TOTAL MAINTENANCE FACILITY AND EQUIPMENT PROJECTS</b>									<b>\$119.92</b>	<b>\$19.99</b>	<b>\$6.15</b>	<b>\$25.08</b>	<b>\$14.70</b>	<b>\$54.00</b>
<b>TRACK AND SIGNAL PROJECTS</b>														
5	3	N	Yolo	Capitol	R677SA	Between Davis and Sacramento on UP Main	Yolo Causeway 2nd Main Track	99	\$17.50					\$17.50
6	3	N	Placer	Capitol	R560SA	West of Colfax Amtrak Station	New Colfax Trainset Layover Facility	98	\$1.30			\$0.30		\$1.00
7	4	N	Alameda	Capitol	R538SB	Between Jack London Square & Elmhurst	New Crossovers, CTC & Coliseum Station	98	\$4.59			\$1.44		\$3.15
8	4	N	Contra Costa	San Joaquin	R559SA	Martinez Station to Port Chicago	Martinez-Port Chicago Speed Upgrade	98	\$6.00					\$6.00
9	5	S	Santa Barbara/ San Luis Obispo	San Diegoan	R675SA	Goleta to San Luis on UP Coast Route	Extend two sidings between Ellwood and San Luis Obispo	99	\$9.00					\$9.00
10	5	S	San Luis Obispo	San Diegoan	R572SA	San Luis Obispo Amtrak Station	New CTC Control Point at San Luis Obispo	98	\$1.10		\$0.10			\$1.00
11	5/7	S	Ventura/ Santa Barbara	San Diegoan	R546SB	Seacliff to Goleta	CTC - Seacliff to Ellwood & CP Goleta	00	\$10.90	\$0.30				\$10.60
12	7	S	Ventura	San Diegoan	R676SA	Between Chatsworth & Simi	Hasson Siding Extension	00	\$5.20					\$5.20
13	7	S	Ventura	San Diegoan	R670SA	Between Chatsworth & Simi - Tunnel #26	Tunnel Improvements to Raise Speeds	99	\$20.00				\$16.00	\$4.00
14	7	S	Ventura	San Diegoan	R673SA	Oxnard Amtrak Station	New Power Switches at Oxnard Siding	99	\$1.50					\$1.50
15	7	S	Los Angeles	San Diegoan	R698SA	Chatsworth Siding & Amtrak Station	Siding Extension & New 2nd Platform	99	\$4.43					\$4.43
16	7	S	Los Angeles	Metrolink/ Sunset	R704SA	Pomona Station	Track work for Intermodal Station	98	\$25.00		\$23.50			\$1.50
17	11	S	San Diego	San Diegoan	R550SB	Del Mar Bluffs along NCTD Tracks	Del Mar Bluffs Stabilization	99	\$4.70			\$0.20		\$4.50
18	11	S	San Diego	San Diegoan	R690SA	Sorrento to Miramar	Second Main Track & Curve Realignment	99	\$30.80			\$25.50		\$5.30
19	11	S	San Diego	San Diegoan	R682SA	San Onofre Siding	San Onofre Siding Extension	99	\$5.60					\$5.60
20	11	S	San Diego	San Diegoan	R685SA	San Diego - Falsebay Passing Track	New Falsebay Passing Track	99	\$5.20			\$3.50		\$1.70
21	11	S	San Diego	San Diegoan	R680SA	Between Oceanside and Fallbrook Jct.	Fallbrook Siding Improvement	00	\$1.30					\$1.30
22	12	S	Orange	San Diegoan	R681SA	Irvine	New Irvine Siding	00	\$3.54					\$3.54
<b>TOTAL TRACK AND SIGNAL PROJECTS</b>									<b>\$157.66</b>	<b>\$0.30</b>	<b>\$23.60</b>	<b>\$30.94</b>	<b>\$16.00</b>	<b>\$86.82</b>
<b>STATION PROJECTS</b>														
23	3	N	Placer	Capitol	R668SA	Rocklin, Auburn & Colfax Stations	Permanent Platforms	98	\$1.62			\$0.98		\$0.64
24	3	N	Sacramento	Capitol	R669SA	Sacramento Amtrak Station	Sacramento Station Improvements	98	\$11.40	\$0.50	\$1.00	\$0.30	\$7.00	\$2.60
25	3	N	Yolo	Capitol	R491SE	Davis Amtrak Station`	Davis Station Parking	98	\$2.58		\$0.94	\$1.06		\$0.58
26	4	N	Contra Costa	Capitol	R539SB	Richmond Amtrak/BART Station	Richmond Station Improvements	98	\$9.29		\$4.14	\$2.65		\$2.50
27	4	N	Contra Costa	Capitol	R297SD	Martinez Amtrak Station	New Amtrak Station and Parking	98	\$37.33		\$15.95	\$6.93	\$11.65	\$2.80
28	6	S	Kern	San Joaquin	R687SA	Bakersfield	New Amtrak Station and Parking	98	\$12.62		\$0.38	\$6.94		\$5.30
29	75	NS	Statewide	Statewide	R554SB	Amtrak California Stations	Statewide ADA Upgrades - Phase III	99	\$5.34					\$5.34
<b>TOTAL STATION PROJECTS</b>									<b>\$80.18</b>	<b>\$0.50</b>	<b>\$22.41</b>	<b>\$18.86</b>	<b>\$18.65</b>	<b>\$19.76</b>
<b>ROUTE EXTENSION AND GRADE SEPARATION PROJECTS</b>														
30	4	N	San Mateo	BART	-	Colma to San Francisco Airport	BART Extension to San Francisco Airport	-	\$11.00					\$11.00
31	7	S	Los Angeles	San Diegoan	R703SA	Glendale Route 134	Grade Separation	01	\$31.82				\$2.82	\$29.00
<b>TOTAL ROUTE EXTENSION AND GRADE SEPARATION PROJECTS</b>									<b>\$42.82</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$2.82</b>	<b>\$40.00</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>									<b>\$400.58</b>	<b>\$20.79</b>	<b>\$52.16</b>	<b>\$74.88</b>	<b>\$52.17</b>	<b>\$200.58</b>

# 1998 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program

(Sorted by Co/Rte/PM)

(Dollars in Thousands)

District	County	Route	BPM	PPNO	EA	General Location	Description	First Year Const.	Grand Total	Future Total	98 STIP Total	98 RIP	98 Loc	98 IIP	98 IIP Cumul. Cost
4	ALA	80	2.5	0054K	25480K	In ALA near the Bay Bridge	Construct extension of EB HOV lane	2000	18,400		18,400	3,400	8,900	6,100	6,100
4	ALA/	680	0.0	0157D	25370K	In ALA and SCI Counties	Construct southbound lane	2003	52,717		52,717	14,717		38,000	44,100
3	BUT	149	0.0	0026C	382210	In Butte County	Construct 4-lane expressway	2001	7,659		7,659			7,659	51,759
10	CAL	4	R21.1	0304B	362500	In Angels Camp	Const 2-Ln expwy,Angel's Bypass-new	2005	34,031	19,665	14,366	11,183		3,183	54,942
6	FRE	41	R7.1	0009G	34215K	Near Easton	2-lane expressway to 4-lane expressway	2004	10,851	9,609	1,242			1,242	56,184
11	IMP	7	1.2	0051G	068000	Near Calexico	Construct 4-lane expressway	2001	37,009		37,052	33,000		4,052	60,236
11	IMP	78	L7.2	0021	167820	Near Brawley in Imperial Co.	Construct 4-lane highway	2003	41,101		40,740			40,740	100,976
11	IMP	111	R10.9	0043H	1993U0	Near El Centro	2-lane highway to 4-lane expressway	2000	1,869		2,852			2,852	103,828
11	IMP	111	R13.1	0044D	199340	Near El Centro	2-lane highway to 4-lane expressway	2001	5,164		5,164			5,164	108,992
11	IMP	111	R17.6	0044L	199360	Near El Centro	2-lane highway to 4-lane expressway	2002	3,579		3,579			3,579	112,571
9	INY	395	54.6	0020A	213001	Lone Pine	Widen to 4-lane conventional	1999	1,273		1,273			1,273	113,844
9	INY	395	64.5	0172	214400	Manzanar	Widen to 4-lane expwy (additional funds)	2003	7,208		7,208			7,208	121,052
9	INY	395	70.3	0191	21480K	Independence 4-lane	Widen to 4-lane expressway	2005	15,593	11,730	3,863			3,863	124,915
6	KER	58	T31.6	3455	40010K	In and near Bakersfield	4 and 6F on new 8F R/W alignment	2004	175,000		175,000	145,000		30,000	154,915
7	LA	5			17860K	In Glendale	Modify Route 5/Western Ave. I/C	2003	22,256		22,256		15,600	6,656	161,571
7	LA	105	0.7	2119	17850K	In LA near LAX	Widen NB Sepulveda Blvd. off-ramp to 2 Lns	2001	10,221		10,202		2,808	7,394	168,965
7	LA	134			17870K	In Glendale	Modify Route 134/San Fernando Road I/C	2001	4,102		4,102			4,102	173,067
7	LA	134			18850K	In Burbank	Modify route 134/Hollywood Way I/C	2003	8,984		8,984		1,000	7,984	181,051
7	LA	710	26.5	2215	187901	In LA, Alhambra,El Sereno, &	Community involvement process for 710 fwy	2009	2,961		2,961			2,961	184,012
7	LA	710	29.4	0219N	0200A1	In So. Pasadena & Pasadena	Repair/preserv. of hist. bldgs. ; R/W only	1999	3,910		3,910			3,910	187,922
7	LA	710	34.9	2019	17190K	In Vernon and Bell	Modify I/C and ramps	2003	11,864		11,864		3,965	7,899	195,821
6	MAD	99	20.1	5410	29330K	Near Madera	4E to 4F with interchange at Ave. 22	2005	33,254	26,150	7,104			7,104	202,925
1	MEN	101	5.8	0167B	30170K	Near Hopland	Construct 4-lane expressway	2001	18,111		18,111			18,111	221,036
1	MEN	101	T43.5	0125F	262000	Near Willits	Convert 2-lane to 4-lane freeway	2003	56,573		56,467	17,300		39,167	260,203
10	MER	99	10.6	0528D	36310K	In Merced	Convert to 4-lane freeway	2004	46,797		46,797	18,500		28,297	288,500

# **1998 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program**

(Sorted by Co/Rte/PM)

(Dollars in Thousands)

District	County	Route	BPM	PPNO	EA	General Location	Description	First Year Const.	Grand Total	Future Total	98 STIP Total	98 RIP	98 Loc	98 IIP	98 IIP Cumul. Cost
10	MER	99	R23.8	5479	41480K	In Merced County	Convert to 4-lane freeway	2004	35,505		35,505			35,505	324,005
10	MER	99	R26.8	0546D	31696K	In Merced County	Convert to 4-lane freeway	2004	31,242		31,242			31,242	355,247
5	MON	101	91.5	0058F	016180	Near Prunedale & Salinas	Construct bypass; 4 lanes w/o full I/C	2004	150,892		150,892	49,200	50,300	51,392	406,639
5	MON	156	R1.3	0057C	31600K	In Castroville	Widen to 4-lane divided expwy. (gap closure)	2004	31,954	27,453	4,501			4,501	411,140
4	MRN	101/5	8.2/3.		115750	In San Rafael & Corte Madera	Reversible HOV Lane	2003	45,524	34,904	10,620	9,420		1,200	412,340
12	ORA	5	42.1	0978T	101670	In Buena Park	Add 1 HOV lane in each direction	2002	27,624		27,624			27,624	439,964
12	ORA	91	R16.5	4671	085200	In ORA and RIV Counties	Auxiliary lanes in Orange County	2000	11,586		11,586			11,586	451,550
12	ORA	605	R0.0	5242	07920K	In Los Alamitos	Close HOV In gap betw. 405 and LA Co. line	2002	10,346		10,346			10,346	461,896
3	PLA	65	12.2	0145M	333800	In and near Lincoln	Route adoption, 4-lane expressway		1,493		1,493	743		750	462,646
3	PLA	49	2.2	4475A	36771K	South of Grass Valley	Widen to 4 lanes with cont. left turn lane	2002	21,062		21,062	9,598		11,464	474,110
8	RIV	71	0.0	0048B	44651K	Near Chino	Widen to 4-lane divided expwy	2001	7,107		7,057			7,057	481,167
8	RIV	91	R0.0	0072D	45660K	Near Corona	Add aux. Ins.; Realign ramps at Green Riv Dr	2002	31,714	26,965	4,749			4,749	485,916
8	RIV	215	42.6	0125J	44940K	In Riverside	Construct SB to EB I-215 flyover connector	2004	49,859		49,859		13,326	36,533	522,449
3	SAC	50	16.1	0220D	369600	Near Folsom	Revise interchange & construct aux. lanes	1999	10,059		10,059	2,029		8,030	530,479
3	SAC/	50	21.2	6199	44163K	About 15 mi E of Sacramento	Construct HOV lanes	2004	28,207		28,207	10,048	2,275	15,884	546,363
5	SB	101	62.6	0900	348900	North of Buellton	Construct new interchange	1999	8,709		8,709		5,709	3,000	549,363
8	SBD	15	R20.8	0170H	44850K	Cajon Pass	Inst. median, conv. exist. rt ln to trck climb ln	2001	8,957		8,957			8,957	558,320
8	SBD	15	41.5	0174H	355500	Between Victorville & Barstow	Add NB outside mixed flow lane	2003	70,667		69,807	36,100		33,707	592,027
8	SBD	15	41.5	0174I	35551G	Between Victorville & Barstow	Add SB only mixed flow lane	2003	83,601		82,311			82,311	674,338
8	SBD	58	R0.0	0215C	347700	Near Kramer Junction	Const 4-lane expwy on new alignment	2006	94,133	89,644	4,489			4,489	678,827
8	SBD	58	T22.4	0217F	04351K	Near Hinkley	Realign/widen 2 to 4-lane expressway	2004	97,794	86,711	11,083			11,083	689,910
5	SBT	156	3.3	0297	34490K	San Juan Bautista	Widen to 4-lane expressway (gap closure)	2005	35,239	26,686	8,553			8,553	698,463
4	SCL	152	11.0	0484	152000	In SCL and SBt Counties	Construct hwy on new alignment. ED only	2009	259,000	252,000	7,000			7,000	705,463
5	SCR	17	10.8	0464	44640K	North of Santa Cruz	Construct truck climbing lane	2004	9,269		9,269	2,000		7,269	712,732
11	SD	905	5.7	0374K	093160	In Otay Mesa in SD County	4-lane expressway(RW for 6-lane fwy)	2003	178,651	92,198	84,621	28,000		56,621	769,353

<b>1998 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program</b> (Sorted by Co/Rte/PM) (Dollars in Thousands)															
District	County	Route	BPM	PPNO	EA	General Location	Description	First Year Const.	Grand Total	Future Total	98 STIP Total	98 RIP	98 Loc	98 IIP	98 IIP Cumul. Cost
2	SHA	299	5.3	0166C	27032K	Buckhorn (Lower, Foothill)	Realign roadway, segment 1B	2003	7,356		7,356			7,356	776,709
2	SHA	299	6.5	0166B	27033K	Buckhorn (Lower, Valley)	Realign roadway, segment 1A	2003	7,165		7,165			7,165	783,874
2	SIS	97	49.3	0244A	28790K	Dorris	Construct 2-lane expressway	2004	18,870		18,870	9,435		9,435	793,309
10	SJ	99	18.6	7673	44540K	In Stockton	Widen to 6 lanes in median	2002	27,007		27,007		14,293	12,714	806,023
10	SJ	205	R3.4	7965B	30016K	In Tracy	Widen 4-lane to 6-lane fwy	2005	54,104	48,201	5,903	2,951		2,952	808,975
5	SLO	46	32.2	0226A	3307UK	East of Paso Robles	Widen from 2-lane hwy to 4-lane expwy	2004	62,678		62,678	29,732		32,946	841,921
5	SLO	46	51.0	4542	45420K	In SLO East of Paso Robles	Lengthen EB & WB passing lanes	2002	5,932		5,932			5,932	847,853
4	SM	1	36.6	0626	112371	In San Mateo County	Construct 2-lane tunnel with approaches	2000	70,171		70,171	2,500	65,171	2,500	850,353
4	SOL	80	12.3	8274	0T160K	Route 80/680 I/C in Fairfield	Recon. I-680 direct connectors & aux. lanes	2003	6,914		6,914			6,914	857,267
4	SOL	80	30.9	8378	33770K	In and near Vacaville	Convert 6-lane fwy to 8-lane fwy. ED only	2006	44,230	41,230	3,000			3,000	860,267
4	SOL	29/37	4.2/9.	0831D	0T1421	In Vallejo	Const. Rte 29/37 interchange, Phase III	2001	54,100		54,100	14,000		40,100	900,367
4	SON	101	19.5		24540K	Route 101 in Sonoma County	2 HOV lanes & modify interchanges	2004	61,530	4,700	56,830	44,830		12,000	912,367
3	SUT	70	0.2	0289B	386410	Near E Nicolaus	Construct 4-lane expressway	2004	44,469		44,469			44,469	956,836
3	SUT	99	8.7	8361A	1A4310	In Sutter Co. near Nicolaus	Widen to provide 4-lane segment	2002	9,621		9,621			9,621	966,457
3	SUT	99	12.9	8354	434900	About 12.2 mi So. of Yuba	Construct passing lane & widen	2000	4,426		4,422			4,422	970,879
3	SUT	99	16.8	8361C	1A4330	South of Yuba City 70/99	Widen to provide 4-lane segment	2002	9,895		9,895	8,471		1,424	972,303
3	SUT	99	21.4	8362B	1A4620	In Sutter Co. So. of Yuba City	Widen to 4 lanes & left turn pockets	2002	14,627		14,627			14,627	986,930
3	SUT/	70	5.0	0289P	386420	North of E Nicolaus	Construct 4-lane expressway	2004	53,329	50,158	3,171			3,171	990,101
2	TRI	299	26.7	0301H	28820K	Near Big Bar	Construct EB and WB passing lanes	2003	4,093		4,093			4,093	994,194
10	TUO	120	R56.5	4934	24340K	Near Yosemite	Yosemite Area Regional Transit System	1999	2,680		2,680			2,680	996,874
7	VEN	126	22.3	2117	17830K	In Filmore	Widen Roadway	2000	1,668		1,668			1,668	998,542
3	YUB/	70	8.3	0364A	37230K	Proposed Marysville bypass	Construct expressway on new alignment	2015	381,881	375,881	6,000	3,000		3,000	1,001,542
3	YUB/	65	9.2	0362A	29730K	From Rte 70 in Yuba County	Construct 4-lane expwy & Br. on new align.	2009	184,028	177,782	6,246	4,500		1,746	1,003,288

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Alameda																
			Total County Share	166,659												
			TEA Share	7,639												
			Unrestricted County Share	159,020												

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	Project Totals by Fiscal Year						Project Totals by Component					
					FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
Berkeley			Train stop & intermodal facility improv's	641	641	0	0	0	0	0	0	641	0	0	0	0
			SUBTOTAL:	3,819	2,003	1,172	0	0	0	0	0	2,740	50	385	0	0
			TEA/RSTP transfer	3,820												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	7,639												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			Incorporates MTC RTIP amendment of April 22.													
			RTIP did not provide FY spreads for planning, programming, and monitoring, or for CMAQ match funds. They are spread here evenly.													
			Oakland Coliseum intercity rail station: also funded from \$3,150 in ITIP.													
			Fremont grade separations: other funding includes \$6,177 Fremont, \$3,617 UPRR.													
			Union City intermodal station: RTIP anticipates completion of project with \$8,015 in Measure B funds.													
			BART train control: other identified funding includes \$5,645 RSTP/CMAQ in FY 01 and \$5,000 BART funds in FY 02.													
			RTIP shows different FY spreads in summary and fact sheets for the HOV extension at the Bay Bridge and for the Fremont intersection improvements.													
			Fact sheet spreads used in this table.													
			Oakland joint intermodal terminal: RTIP amendment identifies other funding as \$10,300 ISTEA (apparently RSTP), \$129,350 Port funds and other sources indicated in the Alameda CMA Long-Range Transportation Plan and in the MTC Regional Transportation Plan.													

## (\$1,000's)

California Transportation Commission

## (\$1,000's)

California Transportation Commission



## (\$1,000's)

California Transportation Commission

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Contra Costa																
			Total County Share	91,679												
			TEA Share	4,759												
			Unrestricted County Share	86,920												
Project Totals by Fiscal Year											Project Totals by Component					
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
<b>Programmed Non-TEA County Share:</b>																
MTC			Planning, programming, and monitoring	322	54	54	53	54	54	53	0	322	0	0	0	0
MTC	loc		CMAQ match reserve	2,500	417	417	416	417	417	416	0	2,500	0	0	0	0
MTC	loc		Translink (automated fare equipment)(SO)	801	0	0	801	0	0	0	0	801	0	0	0	0
MTC	loc		TOS (repair, activate loop detectors)	206	206	0	0	0	0	0	0	206	0	0	0	0
MTC	loc		Regional rideshare program	1,997	274	302	331	347	364	379	0	1,997	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	680		HOV In, Marina Vista-N Main	25,253	4,138	21,115	0	0	0	0	0	16,682	0	4,138	0	4,433
BART	rail		Advanced Automatic Train Control System	10,000	0	10,000	0	0	0	0	0	10,000	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	4		Rt 4 West "Gap Closure" Phase I, Seg 2	25,167	15,140	10,027	0	0	0	0	15,140	8,719	0	0	0	1,308
Caltrans	4		Railroad Av interch & Rt 4 widening, R/W	12,752	0	0	0	12,752	0	0	12,752	0	0	0	0	0
CCTA	loc		Railroad Av interch & Rt 4 widening,const	11,555	0	0	0	0	0	11,555	0	11,555	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	80	242D	Landscaping (cost increases)	571	571	0	0	0	0	0	0	571	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	80	242G	Landscaping (cost increases)	173	0	173	0	0	0	0	0	173	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	80	242H	Landscaping (cost increases)	279	279	0	0	0	0	0	0	279	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	80	242Y	Landscaping (cost increases)	42	0	42	0	0	0	0	0	42	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	680	285Y	Landscaping (cost increases)	298	0	298	0	0	0	0	0	298	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	680	283J	Landscaping (cost increases)	411	0	411	0	0	0	0	0	411	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	680	294B	Landscaping (cost increases)	221	0	221	0	0	0	0	0	221	0	0	0	0
Concord	loc		Video surveillance TSM project	620	620	0	0	0	0	0	0	510	0	110	0	0
Walnut Creek	loc		Treat Blvd signal interconnection	350	350	0	0	0	0	0	0	325	0	25	0	0
Pleasant Hill	loc		Taylor/CC Blvd, signals & interconnect	380	380	0	0	0	0	0	0	340	0	40	0	0
CCCTA	loc		7 buses, cost increment for larger buses	205	205	0	0	0	0	0	0	205	0	0	0	0
AC Transit	loc		15 buses (San Pablo Av), bridge toll match	1,031	0	0	1,031	0	0	0	0	906	0	125	0	0
			SUBTOTAL:	95,134	22,634	43,060	2,632	13,570	835	12,403	27,892	57,063	0	4,438	0	5,741
<b>Deletion of 1996 Project, Reconciliation to Non-TEA Share:</b>																
Caltrans	680	298B	Rt 4/680 interchange, R/W only	-5,835	0	0	0	-5,835	0	0	-5,835	0	0	0	0	0
			SUBTOTAL:	89,299	22,634	43,060	2,632	7,735	835	12,403	22,057	57,063	0	4,438	0	5,741
			TEA/RSTP transfer	-2,379												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	86,920												
<b>TEA Restricted Share:</b>																
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	510												
CCTA	TEA		Rt 4 East Landscaping	1,870	1,870	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,870	0	0	0	0
			SUBTOTAL:	2,380												
			TEA/RSTP transfer	2,379												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	4,759												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			Incorporates MTC RTIP amendment of April 22.													
			RTIP did not provide FY spreads for planning, programming, and monitoring, or for CMAQ match funds. They are spread here evenly.													
			Rt 680 HOV lanes: \$13,508 in Measure C funds, including \$640 for environmental, \$12,888 for construction.													
			BART train control: other identified funding includes \$2,530 RSTP/CMAQ in FY 01 and \$5,000 BART funds in FY 02.													
			Rt 4 West: \$2,082 in Measure C funds, including \$1,446 for design and \$636 for construction.													

## SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	Project Totals by Fiscal Year						Project Totals by Component					
					FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
			Rt 4, Railroad Av interchange: \$37,326 in Measure C funds, including \$1,061 for environmental, \$5,135 for design, and \$31,130 for construction.													
			Caltrans responsible for right-of-way (though RTIP does not identify R/W and R/W support costs separately); CCTA responsible for construction.													
			CCCTA buses: \$1,840 Sec 9, \$486 local.													

## (\$1,000's)

California Transportation Commission Page 8 5/12/98

## (\$1,000's)

California Transportation Commission Page 9 5/12/98

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Fresno																
			Total County Share	68,332												
			TEA Share	5,025												
			Unrestricted County Share	63,307												
				Project Totals by Fiscal Year						Project Totals by Component						
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
<b>Programmed Non-TEA County Share:</b>																
COFCG			Planning, programming, and monitoring	342	57	57	57	57	57	57	0	342	0	0	0	0
COFCG			CMAQ match reserve	2,500	417	417	416	417	417	416	0	2,500	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	180	90E	New 4L freeway, Chestnut Av-Clovis Av	78,045	8,858	6,115	61,886	1,186	0	0	15,274	53,502	0	5,102	1,425	2,742
			SUBTOTAL:	80,887	9,332	6,589	62,359	1,660	474	473	15,274	56,344	0	5,102	1,425	2,742
<b>Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:</b>																
			Requested advance: Route 180	-17,580												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	63,307												
<b>TEA Restricted Share:</b>																
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	5,025												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	5,025												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			RTIP did not provide FY spreads for planning, programming, and monitoring, or for CMAQ match funds. They are spread here evenly.													

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Glenn																
			Total County Share	9,043												
			TEA Share	414												
			Unrestricted County Share	8,629												
Project Totals by Fiscal Year											Project Totals by Component					
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
<b>Programmed Non-TEA County Share:</b>																
Glenn CTC			Planning, programming, and monitoring	112	19	18	19	18	19	19	0	112	0	0	0	0
Glenn CTC	loc		Short term reserve	65	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	32	92B	Realign roadway in Orland	4,209	681	0	0	211	865	2,452	1,365	1,601	184	497	365	197
Willows	loc		Turn lane, signals, Rt 162/Tehama St	200	200	0	0	0	0	0	1	190	1	8	0	0
Willows	loc		Tehama St rehab, Cedar-Sycamore	500	3	497	0	0	0	0	2	473	3	22	0	0
Willows	loc		Sycamore St rehab, Culver-Villa	250	0	2	248	0	0	0	2	236	2	10	0	0
Willows	loc		Hwy 162 landscape, turn lane, overlay	600	0	0	4	596	0	0	3	578	4	15	0	0
Willows	loc		Interstate 5 soundwall feasibility study	39	0	0	0	14	25	0	0	0	14	25	0	0
Glenn County	loc		Co Road P at Stony Creek (HBRR match)	1,420	0	0	0	0	1,420	0	0	1,420	0	0	0	0
Glenn County	loc		Road 33 at Walker Creek (HBRR match)	164	0	164	0	0	0	0	0	164	0	0	0	0
Glenn County	loc		Road Z at Campbell Slough (HBRR match)	121	0	0	121	0	0	0	0	121	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	32	3775	Stony Crk, replace bridge (SHOPP \$11,010)	949	821	14	7	101	3	3	98	0	100	688	63	0
			SUBTOTAL:	8,629	1,789	695	399	940	2,332	2,474	1,471	4,960	308	1,265	428	197
<b>Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:</b>																
			Reserve for 2000 STIP	0												
			SUBTOTAL:	8,629												
			Unidentified	0												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	8,629												
<b>TEA Restricted Share:</b>																
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	414												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	414												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			For I-5 soundwall, total estimated cost is \$1,500.													
			For HBRR projects, HBRR shares are \$1,000 for Co Rd P, \$656 for Co Rd 33, and \$483 for Co Rd Z.													
			For Rt 32 Stony Creek Bridge, SHOPP cost will be part of future SHOPP amendment.													
			This table includes costs for 3 projects without PSRs that Glenn County will consider placing in reserve at its May 21 meeting. SEE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS.													
			Projects are in Willows, turn lane (\$200), landscaping (\$600), and soundwall (\$39).													

## (\$1,000's)

California Transportation Commission



## (\$1,000's)

5/12/98

## (\$1,000's)

5/12/98

## (\$1,000's)

5/12/98

## (\$1,000's)

5/12/98

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Lake																
			Total County Share	11,662												
			TEA Share	621												
			Unrestricted County Share	11,041												
Project Totals by Fiscal Year											Project Totals by Component					
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
<b>Programmed Non-TEA County Share:</b>																
Lake CCAPC			Planning, programming, and monitoring	233	86	26	81	28	6	6	0	233	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	29		Rt 281-Rt 175, 4-lane expressway	2,839	1,456	0	0	1,383	0	0	1,000	0	606	850	383	0
			SUBTOTAL:	3,072	1,542	26	81	1,411	6	6	1,000	233	606	850	383	0
<b>Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:</b>																
			Reserve for 2000 STIP	586												
			SUBTOTAL:	3,658												
			Unidentified	7,383												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	11,041												
<b>TEA Restricted Share:</b>																
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	621												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	621												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			"Capital reserve" was listed in FY 01, here listed as reserve for 2000 STIP.													
			Did not include project component breakdown by FY. Figures here estimated from fact sheets.													
			"Unidentified" above is identified in RTIP as needed for Lake-29 beyond STIP period.													
			Updated per letter of April 24.													

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Lassen																
			Total County Share	19,860												
			TEA Share	909												
			Unrestricted County Share	18,951												
				Project Totals by Fiscal Year						Project Totals by Component						
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
<b>Programmed Non-TEA County Share:</b>																
Lassen CTC			Planning, programming, and monitoring	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lassen County	loc	2046	Skyline Rd East (2.06 mi new rd)	4,571	556	1,671	2,344	0	0	0	390	3,873	0	308	0	0
Lassen County	loc	2047	Skyline Rd Extension (0.8 mi new rd)	3,046	255	784	2,007	0	0	0	679	2,007	153	207	0	0
Lassen County	loc	2048	Skyline Rd South (new rd under study)	6,277	363	726	5,188	0	0	0	512	5,188	153	424	0	0
Lassen County	loc	2049	Widen CR A-2, rehab Bieber Lookout Rd	4,394	406	3,988	0	0	0	0	0	3,988	51	355	0	0
			SUBTOTAL:	18,288	1,580	7,169	9,539	0	0	0	1,581	15,056	357	1,294	0	0
<b>Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:</b>																
			Reserve for 2000 STIP	663												
			SUBTOTAL:	18,951												
			Unidentified	0												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	18,951												
<b>TEA Restricted Share:</b>																
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	909												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	909												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			State only requested for all 4 projects.													
			RTIP did not specify use of unprogrammed \$663 balance; here assumed reserve for 2000 STIP.													

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Los Angeles																
			Total County Share	738,137												
			TEA Share	48,388												
			Unrestricted County Share	689,749												
						Project Totals by Fiscal Year					Project Totals by Component					
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
Programmed Non-TEA County Share:																
LACMTA	loc	4MAD	Planning, programming, and monitoring	3,700	1,000	1,000	500	400	400	400	0	3,700	0	0	0	0
LACMTA	rail	4NHO	Red Line North Hollywood extension	162,200	162,200	0	0	0	0	0	12,000	150,200	0	0	0	0
LACMTA	rail	4RRS	Short term reserve: rail	10,000	0	10,000	0	0	0	0	0	10,000	0	0	0	0
Ala Corr TA	loc	4374	Alameda Corridor: 26 grade seps (SO)	150,000	23,205	57,383	59,305	10,107	0	0	0	150,000	0	0	0	0
Burbank	loc	4172	Purchase 2 electric buses (loc \$180)	305	305	0	0	0	0	0	0	305	0	0	0	0
Los Angeles	loc	7072	Rt 2 reconfig, Beloit-Bev Hills (cost incr)	1,000	0	1,000	0	0	0	0	0	1,000	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	5	4292	HOV lane, Rosecrans-Florence	82,645	0	0	0	5,877	76,768	0	2,356	64,706	0	5,877	0	9,706
Caltrans	10	4289	HOV lane, Rt 57-SBd Co Line (loc \$12,590)	69,008	0	69,008	0	0	0	0	0	69,008	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	14	4273	HOV, Escondido Cyn-P'blossom(loc \$8983)	34,805	34,805	0	0	0	0	0	0	29,282	0	0	0	5,523
Caltrans	91	4SW1	Soundwall, Rt 605-Orange Co Line	1,424	0	1,424	0	0	0	0	0	997	0	427	0	0
Caltrans	101	4257	LA St-Center St, SB improvements	15,655	0	0	0	0	0	15,655	7,105	6,460	0	1,518	572	0
Caltrans	138	4287	Widening, Longview Rd-Rt 18 (cost incr)	8,000	0	0	0	8,000	0	0	0	8,000	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	210	4SW2	Soundwall, Rt 134-Sunflower Av (loc \$1281)	3,185	0	3,185	0	0	0	0	0	3,185	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	405	4270	NB HOV lane, Rt 90-Rt 10	73,138	15,512	0	0	0	57,626	0	8,185	52,670	147	5,593	1,587	4,956
Caltrans	405	837A	SB HOV lane, Rt 90-Rt 10 (cost incr)	5,452	0	0	0	0	5,452	0	0	5,452	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	405	831	Arbor Vitae interchange (cost incr)	8,700	0	0	8,700	0	0	0	0	8,700	0	0	0	0
Glendale	loc	4177	Purchase 2 CNG heavy duty vehs (loc \$100)	300	300	0	0	0	0	0	0	300	0	0	0	0
Los Angeles	loc	4293	Realign Alameda St & N Spring (loc \$1955)	3,600	0	65	404	3,131	0	0	65	3,131	0	404	0	0
Los Angeles	loc	4163	DASH Union/Echo Park vehicle (loc \$440)	1,759	1,759	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,759	0	0	0	0
Los Angeles	loc	4191	DASH El Sereno vehicle (loc \$176)	703	703	0	0	0	0	0	0	703	0	0	0	0
LA County	loc	4219	Willowbrook trolley/van rehab (loc \$105)	210	210	0	0	0	0	0	0	210	0	0	0	0
Vernon	loc	4300	Atlantic/Bandini intersec improves(loc \$4970)	9,800	0	0	9,800	0	0	0	4,900	3,900	0	1,000	0	0
SCAG	loc	4RSH	Core Rideshare (loc \$2000)	17,700	1,400	3,260	3,260	3,260	3,260	3,260	0	17,700	0	0	0	0
			SUBTOTAL:	663,289	241,399	146,325	81,969	30,775	143,506	19,315	34,611	591,368	147	14,819	2,159	20,185
Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:																
LACMTA	rail	4RRS	Reserve for 2000 STIP: rail	30,000												
			SUBTOTAL:	693,289												
Deletion of 1996 STIP Project, Reconciliation to Non-TEA Share:																
LA County	loc	7031	Signal synchronization	-3,540	-3,540	0	0	0	0	0	0	-3,540	0	0	0	0
			SUBTOTAL:	689,749	237,859	146,325	81,969	30,775	143,506	19,315	34,611	587,828	147	14,819	2,159	20,185
			Unidentified	0												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	689,749												
TEA Restricted Share:																
Avalon		4410	Avalon Cyn Rd bikeway/walkway, scenic dr	530	530	0	0	0	0	0	0	530	0	0	0	0
Burbank		4078	Burbank-LA Chandler Blvd Accessway	1,000	0	500	500	0	0	0	0	1,000	0	0	0	0
Calabasas		4100	US 101 bike lane gap closure	559	0	258	301	0	0	0	0	559	0	0	0	0
Compton		4113	Compton Creek Regional Bikeway	450	0	0	450	0	0	0	0	450	0	0	0	0
Culver City		4122	Ballona Crk ped bridge reconstruction	250	239	11	0	0	0	0	0	250	0	0	0	0
Foothill Transit		4199	Eastland Timed Transfer Center	2,639	2,639	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,639	0	0	0	0

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	Project Totals by Fiscal Year						Project Totals by Component					
					FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
La Mirada		4125	Coyote Creek bikeway	424	0	424	0	0	0	0	0	424	0	0	0	0
LACMTA		2061	Santa Monica BI transit parkway	1,540	1,540	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,540	0	0	0	0
LACMTA		4124	Santa Monica BI transit parkway	700	0	300	400	0	0	0	0	700	0	0	0	0
LACMTA		4101	Mariachi Plaza pedestrian improvements	300	0	215	85	0	0	0	0	300	0	0	0	0
Los Angeles		2080	Exposition Blvd R/W bikeway, Phase I	1,899	1,899	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,899	0	0	0	0
Los Angeles		2076	San Fernando Rd Metrolink bike path, ph I	1,132	1,132	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,132	0	0	0	0
Los Angeles		4105	Northeast Community Linkages-Phase I	1,723	0	865	858	0	0	0	0	1,723	0	0	0	0
Los Angeles		4091	Pico Aliso ped link to Mariachi Plaza	1,263	0	341	922	0	0	0	0	1,263	0	0	0	0
Los Angeles		4104	Blue Line ped grade sep near 53rd St	2,000	0	1,200	800	0	0	0	0	2,000	0	0	0	0
Los Angeles		4081	San Fernando Rd R/W bike path, ph II	218	0	20	198	0	0	0	0	218	0	0	0	0
Los Angeles		4090	Lani ped improvements-Phase II (4 areas)	870	0	127	743	0	0	0	0	870	0	0	0	0
Los Angeles		4165	MacArthur Park station improvements	1,545	1,545	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,545	0	0	0	0
LA County		4128	Arroyo Seco bikeway	1,600	0	311	1,289	0	0	0	0	1,600	0	0	0	0
LA County		4181	County/USC Med Center bus transit station	2,012	2,012	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,012	0	0	0	0
Redondo Beach		4087	Bay Cities Regional Bikeway	806	0	806	0	0	0	0	0	806	0	0	0	0
Santa Clarita		4089	Pedestrian access to transit stops	400	0	200	200	0	0	0	0	400	0	0	0	0
Torrance		4088	Del Amo Bus Dist streetscape & bike	326	0	48	278	0	0	0	0	326	0	0	0	0
			SUBTOTAL:	24,186	11,536	5,626	7,024	0	0	0	0	24,186	0	0	0	0
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	24,202												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	48,388												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			RTIP includes \$40 million rail reserve over 4 years without making distinction between short term reserve and reserve for 2000 STIP; there are treated separately here.													
			RTIP lists North Hollywood Extension total costs at \$1,310,822 including the following other fund sources:													
			\$760,716 Federal; \$166,130 State (including \$57,800 State STP); \$216,976 local; and \$4,900 1996 STIP funds allocated in May 1998.													
			The Alameda Corridor project is the Mid-Corridor segment, 25th St to Route 91. RTIP lists total costs of \$2,019,665, with the following other fund sources:													
			Ports of LA/LB, \$391,400; ACTA revenue bonds, \$784,859; Prop C, \$77,248; Interest/other, \$79,053; Prior STIP, \$48,100; State TSM, \$8,433;													
			State intercity rail, \$7,000; RSTP, \$71,572; EDA, \$2,000; DOT Loan, \$400,000.													
			Rt 405 SB HOV lanes: total cost is \$57,370, including \$42,370 from 96 STIP and \$9548 local.													
			Arbor Vitae interchange: total cost is \$32,534, including \$21,868 from 96 STIP and \$1,966 local.													
			The Rt 2 reconfiguration project: total cost \$69,222, including \$8,235 from 96 STIP (Santa Monica transit parkway), \$23,900 ISTE (apparently RSTP), and \$36,087 local.													
			Of the local amount, \$19,093 is committed by MTA and the remaining \$16,994 "is being sought through ISTE II, ITIP, Caltrans relinquishment funding, and City/County funds.													
			The City of Vernon Atlantic/Bandini project is tied to an ITIP project in the same area that is funded with \$7,899 ITIP and \$3,965 local funds.													
			RTIP amendment of April 3 identifies 3 Caltrans projects with funding shortfalls:													
			\$1,300 for project #4289, Route 10 HOV, Route 57 to San Bernardino County Line													
			\$1,500 for project #4257, Route 101, Los Angeles St to Center, SB improvements													
			\$4,000 for project #831, Route 405 interchange at Arbor Vitae Street													



## (\$1,000's)

5/12/98

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Marin																
			Total County Share	21,409												
			TEA Share	1,574												
			Unrestricted County Share	19,835												
				Project Totals by Fiscal Year						Project Totals by Component						
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
<b>Programmed Non-TEA County Share:</b>																
MTC			Planning, programming, and monitoring	107	18	18	18	17	18	18	0	107	0	0	0	0
MTC	loc		CMAQ match reserve	689	115	115	115	114	115	115	0	689	0	0	0	0
MTC	loc		Translink (automated fare equipment)(SO)	221	0	0	221	0	0	0	0	221	0	0	0	0
MTC	loc		Regional rideshare program	550	76	83	91	96	100	104	0	550	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	101		SB HOV Gap Closure	18,020	1,620	5,270	11,130	0	0	0	5,090	11,130	0	1,220	580	0
Caltrans	101		Preliminary work for NB reversible HOV	11,024	1,024	10,000	0	0	0	0	0	9,820	1,024	180	0	0
			SUBTOTAL:	30,611	2,853	15,486	11,575	227	233	237	5,090	22,517	1,024	1,400	580	0
<b>Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:</b>																
			Transfer from Stanislaus County	-10,000												
			Reserve for 2000 STIP	11												
			SUBTOTAL:	20,622												
			TEA/RSTP transfer	-787												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	19,835												
<b>TEA Restricted Share:</b>																
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	787												
			SUBTOTAL:	787												
			TEA/RSTP transfer	787												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	1,574												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			Incorporates MTC RTIP amendment of April 22.													
			RTIP did not provide FY spreads for planning, programming, and monitoring, or for CMAQ match funds. They are spread here evenly.													
			SB HOV Gap Closure augments funding and scope from 1996 STIP.													
			NB HOV: RTIP does not provide breakdown of costs by component, other fund sources, or estimate of funding through construction.													

## (\$1,000's)

California Transportation Commission Page 23 5/12/98

## (\$1,000's)

California Transportation Commission Page 24 5/12/98

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Merced																
			Total County Share	22,184												
			TEA Share	1,631												
			Unrestricted County Share	20,553												
				Project Totals by Fiscal Year						Project Totals by Component						
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
<b>Programmed Non-TEA County Share:</b>																
MCAG			Planning, programming, and monitoring	110	18	18	19	18	18	19	0	110	0	0	0	0
MCAG			CMAQ match reserve	688	115	115	114	115	115	114	0	688	0	0	0	0
MCAG			Rideshare Program	150	25	25	25	25	25	25	0	150	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	99	528D	Fwy conversion, Campus/Healy (RTIP)	17,994	306	917	329	570	722	15,150	3,477	11,653	306	917	324	1,317
Caltrans	152	5707	Los Banos Bypass study, rt adoption	800	800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	800	0	0	0
Merced County	loc		Campus Parkway, enviro, rt selection	250	250	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	250	0	0	0
			SUBTOTAL:	19,992	1,514	1,075	487	728	880	15,308	3,477	12,601	1,356	917	324	1,317
<b>Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:</b>																
			Reserve for 2000 STIP (see note below)	561												
			SUBTOTAL:	20,553												
			Unidentified	0												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	20,553												
<b>TEA Restricted Share:</b>																
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	1,631												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	1,631												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			The Rt 99 freeway conversion project would also be funded with \$27,562 from the ITIP.													
			ITIP also includes 2 other freeway conversion projects on Rt 99 in Merced County, at a total cost of \$66,747.													
			RTIP does not identify ultimate cost and possible funding sources for Campus Parkway or the Los Banos Bypass.													
			RTIP identifies a "short term reserve," no FY identified. Context suggests this was intended as reserve for 2000 STIP.													
			Updated per letter of April 22.													

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Modoc																
			Total County Share	10,895												
			TEA Share	499												
			Unrestricted County Share	10,396												
				Project Totals by Fiscal Year						Project Totals by Component						
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
<b>Programmed Non-TEA County Share:</b>																
Modoc LTC			Planning, programming, and monitoring	218	49	49	50	36	14	20	0	218	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	299		W Mill St to US 395 (Alturas), env only	120	0	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	0	0	0
Alturas	loc		Warner/Carlos Truck Route	2,305	105	2,200	0	0	0	0	15	2,185	20	85	0	0
Modoc County	loc		CR 90 bridges (HBRR 20% match)	300	150	150	0	0	0	0	0	300	0	0	0	0
Modoc County	loc		CR 56 realign, widen (HES 10% match)	30	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	0	0	0	0
Modoc County	loc		Various co rds, illumination (HES match)	48	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	0	0	0	0
			SUBTOTAL:	3,021	382	2,519	50	36	14	20	15	2,781	140	85	0	0
<b>Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:</b>																
			Reserve for 2000 STIP: Rt 299 project	3,238												
			Reserve for 2000 STIP	4,137												
			SUBTOTAL:	10,396												
			Unidentified	0												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	10,396												
<b>TEA Restricted Share:</b>																
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	499												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	499												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			Updated per April 14 letter.													

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Mono															
			Total County Share	32,292											
			TEA Share	1,452											
			Unrestricted County Share	30,840											

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Monterey																
			Total County Share	36,752												
			TEA Share	2,703												
			Unrestricted County Share	34,049												
				Project Totals by Fiscal Year						Project Totals by Component						
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
<b>Programmed Non-TEA County Share:</b>																
TAMC			Planning, programming, and monitoring	735	123	122	123	122	123	122	0	735	0	0	0	0
TAMC	loc		RSTP/CMAQ match reserve	142	24	24	23	24	24	23	0	142	0	0	0	0
AMBAG	loc		Ridesharing program	617	133	146	161	177	0	0	0	617	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	1	27	Hatton Canyon Parkway (Cost Increase)	9,655	9,655	0	0	0	0	0	0	9,655	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	101	58F	Prunedale Bypass (increased funding)	49,200	0	0	0	0	0	49,200	0	49,200	0	0	0	0
			SUBTOTAL:	60,349	9,935	292	307	323	147	49,345	0	60,349	0	0	0	0
<b>Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:</b>																
			Requested advance: Route 101	-26,300												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	34,049												
<b>TEA Restricted Share:</b>																
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	2,703												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	2,703												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			1996 STIP includes \$45,000 in reserve for Prunedale Bypass.													
			ITIP includes \$51,392 for Route 101 Prunedale Bypass.													
			Additional funding for Route 101 Prunedale Bypass includes \$50,300 local commitment from local sales tax initiative or other local funding.													
			Modified for April 3 letter from TAMC, providing spreads for ridesharing and CMAQ/RSTP reserve.													
			Modified for April 22 letter from TAMC regarding Prunedale Bypass.													



## (\$1,000's)

California Transportation Commission Page 29 5/12/98

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Nevada																
			Total County Share	10,365												
			TEA Share	762												
			Unrestricted County Share	9,603												
				Project Totals by Fiscal Year						Project Totals by Component						
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
<b>Programmed Non-TEA County Share:</b>																
Nevada CTC			Planning, programming, and monitoring	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	49	4475A	Placer CL-Wolf/Combie Rd, widen (RTIP)	9,603	0	805	720	8,078	0	0	466	6,765	236	720	103	1,313
			SUBTOTAL:	9,603	0	805	720	8,078	0	0	466	6,765	236	720	103	1,313
<b>Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:</b>																
			Reserve for 2000 STIP	0												
			SUBTOTAL:	9,603												
			Unidentified	0												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	9,603												
<b>TEA Restricted Share:</b>																
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	762												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	762												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			The balance of the Rt 49 project (\$11,458) is funded from the ITIP.													
			Did not include project component breakdown by FY. Figures here estimated from fact sheet.													

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Orange																
			<b>Total County Share</b>	<b>220,302</b>												
			<b>TEA Share</b>	<b>13,164</b>												
			<b>Unrestricted County Share</b>	<b>207,138</b>												
Project Totals by Fiscal Year											Project Totals by Component					
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
<b>Programmed Non-TEA County Share:</b>																
OCTA			Planning, programming, and monitoring	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	55	3530+	Rt 22-Rt 91, mixed flow lanes (loc \$4,287)	100,915	100,915	0	0	0	0	0	0	86,155	0	278	371	14,111
Caltrans	73	4007+	Rt 73/405 interchange improvements	64,157	5,727	58,430	0	0	0	0	4,923	48,730	0	666	138	9,700
Caltrans	5	2589	Soundwalls, Dana Point	3,136	455	2,681	0	0	0	0	0	2,332	138	210	107	349
Caltrans	90	4434	Imperial Hwy grade sep, near Orangethorpe	46,155	1,187	3,070	19,043	0	22,855	0	17,452	21,545	1,187	3,070	1,591	1,310
SCRRA	rail		Lincoln Av double tracking, 17th-Almond	5,849	0	5,849	0	0	0	0	0	5,849	0	0	0	0
			<b>SUBTOTAL:</b>	<b>220,212</b>	<b>108,284</b>	<b>70,030</b>	<b>19,043</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>22,855</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>22,375</b>	<b>164,611</b>	<b>1,325</b>	<b>4,224</b>	<b>2,207</b>	<b>25,470</b>
<b>Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:</b>																
			TEA/RSTP transfer	-13,164												
			<b>SUBTOTAL:</b>	<b>207,048</b>												
			Unidentified	90												
			<b>TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE</b>	<b>207,138</b>												
<b>TEA Restricted Share:</b>																
			TEA/RSTP transfer	13,164												
			<b>TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE</b>	<b>13,164</b>												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			Rt 73/405 interchange improvements: other fund sources include:													
			\$8,997 Transportation Corridor Agencies' fees													
			\$2,929 local, including city funds, Measure M.													
			RTIP used Draft Fund Estimate rather than Final Fund Estimate; hence \$90 not identified for programming.													

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Placer TPA																
			Total County Share	26,216												
			TEA Share	1,234												
			Unrestricted County Share	24,982												
Project Totals by Fiscal Year											Project Totals by Component					
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
<b>Programmed Non-TEA County Share:</b>																
PCTPA	loc		Planning, programming, and monitoring	340	57	56	57	57	56	57	0	340	0	0	0	0
PCTPA	loc		CMAQ match (rideshare)	9	2	1	2	1	2	1	0	9	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	rail		Auburn rail station (RTIP)	365	365	0	0	0	0	0	0	365	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	rail		Colfax rail station (RTIP)	125	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	rail		Rocklin rail station (RTIP)	487	487	0	0	0	0	0	0	487	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	rail		Layover facilities & track work (RTIP)	300	300	0	0	0	0	0	0	300	0	0	0	0
Loomis	loc		Loomis depot renovation (loc \$15)	100	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	65		Lincoln Bypass env, design (RTIP)	2,200	750	1,450	0	0	0	0	0	0	750	1,450	0	0
Caltrans	65		Expwy, Blue Oaks-Industrial (loc \$6471)	11,140	11,140	0	0	0	0	0	0	9,370	0	94	0	1,676
Caltrans	80		Douglas/Sunrise interch (loc \$10,350)	8,690	580	971	7,139	0	0	0	881	5,301	86	494	90	1,838
Caltrans	49		Improv, Rt 80-Dry Creek Rd (loc \$2479)	13,027	1,799	785	1,013	0	9,430	0	1,013	8,100	364	1,435	785	1,330
			SUBTOTAL:	36,783	15,705	3,263	8,211	58	9,488	58	1,894	24,497	1,200	3,473	875	4,844
<b>Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:</b>																
			Requested advance: Route 49	-11,801												
			SUBTOTAL:	24,982												
			Unidentified	0												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	24,982												
<b>TEA Restricted Share:</b>																
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	1,234												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	1,234												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			Did not provide spread for planning, programming, and monitoring. It is spread here evenly.													
			Requested advance of county share for Rt 49 improvements.													
			Rail station projects (Auburn, Colfax, Rocklin): \$977 from RTIP would match \$640 from ITIP.													
			Track work: \$300 from RTIP to match \$1,000 from ITIP.													
			For the Lincoln Bypass project:													
			ITIP also includes \$750 for environmental work leading to route adoption.													
			The City of Lincoln has committed \$1,000 to match the RTIP's \$1450 for PS&E.													
			Loomis depot has no existing or planned rail service. Project apparently a bus station.													
			This chart includes RTIP modification approved by PCTPA board on March 25.													

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Plumas																
			Total County Share	10,893												
			TEA Share	566												
			Unrestricted County Share	10,327												
				Project Totals by Fiscal Year						Project Totals by Component						
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
<b>Programmed Non-TEA County Share:</b>																
Plumas CTC			Planning, programming, and monitoring	218	36	37	36	36	37	36	0	218	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	70	691	Spring Garden, realign highway	1,265	225	0	890	0	150	0	150	0	225	800	90	0
Caltrans	89	5800	Clio, realign curves	1,747	0	100	75	233	1,339	0	108	1,174	100	125	75	165
Plumas County	loc	2042	CR 506, Graeagle-Johnsonville, reconstruct	1,116	60	1,056	0	0	0	0	25	1,056	10	25	0	0
Plumas County	loc	2045	CR 109, rehab and safety	2,027	0	0	52	1,417	558	0	0	1,975	30	22	0	0
Portola	loc	2044	West St, reconstruction & rehab	1,700	129	1,571	0	0	0	0	21	1,571	17	91	0	0
Portola	loc	2043	Gulling St, traffic signalization	622	0	0	65	557	0	0	18	557	4	43	0	0
			SUBTOTAL:	8,695	450	2,764	1,118	2,243	2,084	36	322	6,551	386	1,106	165	165
<b>Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:</b>																
			Reserve for 2000 STIP	1,632												
			SUBTOTAL:	10,327												
			Unidentified	0												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	10,327												
<b>TEA Restricted Share:</b>																
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	566												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	566												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			Table based on April 23 RTIP amendment.													
			RTIP did not provide FY spread for planning, programming, and monitoring. It is spread here evenly across 6 years.													
			RTIP identified "reserve" without designating type of reserve. It is here assumed a reserve for the 2000 STIP.													

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Riverside																
			Total County Share	147,105												
			TEA Share	9,019												
			Unrestricted County Share	138,086												
Project Totals by Fiscal Year											Project Totals by Component					
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
<b>Programmed Non-TEA County Share:</b>																
RCTC			Planning, programming, and monitoring	2,752	1,376	1,376	0	0	0	0	0	2,752	0	0	0	0
RCTC			Rideshare program	1,220	0	0	610	610	0	0	0	1,220	0	0	0	0
RCTC			Call box traffic monitoring	1,100	500	600	0	0	0	0	0	1,100	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	215	33480	HOV,TCL, El Cerrito Dr-60/91/215 (incr)	45,124	0	-4,987	0	0	50,111	0	-7,685	47,371	0	2,592	106	2,740
Caltrans	215	46730	HOV/TCL, Box Springs OH-Fair Isle Dr	24,837	0	2,631	3,244	0	18,962	0	2,896	16,417	0	2,631	348	2,545
Caltrans	215	46683	Truck bypass, Eucalyptus-Fair Isle (incr)	13,078	0	8,674	0	4,404	0	0	7,821	4,859	0	-598	1,451	-455
Caltrans	215	46681	HOV,TCL, Box Springs-El Cerrito Dr	19,704	0	1,973	3,014	0	14,717	0	2,615	12,748	0	1,973	399	1,969
Caltrans	215	46271	NB 215 to WB 91 flyover (incr)	2,283	7,740	0	0	0	-5,457	0	7,740	-5,457	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	10	45600	Ramon Rd interch improvements	22,266	547	2,157	1,024	0	0	18,538	797	16,144	547	2,157	227	2,394
CVAG	loc		Signal synchronization	2,800	800	2,000	0	0	0	0	0	2,800	0	0	0	0
SunLine	loc		Metrolink bus purchase	300	300	0	0	0	0	0	0	300	0	0	0	0
			SUBTOTAL:	135,464	11,263	14,424	7,892	5,014	78,333	18,538	14,184	100,254	547	8,755	2,531	9,193
<b>Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:</b>																
CVAG			Reserve for 2000 STIP: I-10 interchange	1,245												
Blythe			Reserve for 2000 STIP	1,377												
			SUBTOTAL:	138,086												
			Unidentified	0												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	138,086												
<b>TEA Restricted Share:</b>																
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	9,019												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	9,019												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			For the 5 Rt 215 projects, the RTIP indicates a total cost of \$274,192. Of this amount:													
			\$154,926 was funded in the 1996 STIP.													
			\$105,026 is proposed in this RTIP for the 98 STIP.													
			\$14,240 would be from local funds.													
			ITIP also includes \$36,533 for a project on Route 215 within this area.													
			Did not include project component breakdown by FY. Figures here estimated from fact sheets.													

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Sacramento																
			<b>Total County Share</b>	<b>96,338</b>												
			<b>TEA Share</b>	<b>6,365</b>												
			<b>Unrestricted County Share</b>	<b>89,973</b>												
Project Totals by Fiscal Year											Project Totals by Component					
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
<b>Programmed Non-TEA County Share:</b>																
SACOG			Planning, programming, and monitoring	482	76	78	79	81	83	85	0	482	0	0	0	0
Sac RT	rail		Folsom ext, Sunrise-Iron Pt Rd (\$4700 loc)	31,182	419	4,823	25,940	0	0	0	615	25,940	419	4,208	0	0
Sac RT	rail		21st Street Station, So Sac R/W (\$110 loc)	770	13	130	627	0	0	0	13	657	0	100	0	0
Sac RT	rail		Swanston station ped xing (\$1,000 loc)	1,185	55	1,130	0	0	0	0	30	999	25	131	0	0
Sac RT	rail		Double tracking NE line for express service	494	100	394	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	394	0	0
Sac RT	rail		Lumberjack Curve, straighten & double track	494	100	394	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	394	0	0
Sac County	loc		Greenback Lane interch, Rt 80 (\$5211 loc)	4,920	0	4,920	0	0	0	0	581	4,339	0	0	0	0
Sac County	loc		Madison Av interch, Rt 80 (\$6123 loc)	4,461	0	247	4,214	0	0	0	247	4,214	0	0	0	0
Sac County	loc		Folsom Bl widen, Sunrise-Aerojet (\$66 loc)	5,189	370	4,819	0	0	0	0	250	4,332	184	423	0	0
Sac County	loc		Sunrise Blvd interchange, US 50 (\$3783 loc)	7,855	0	1,127	6,728	0	0	0	0	6,728	0	1,127	0	0
Sacramento	loc		Arden Garden Connector (\$5580 loc)(SO)	3,604	3,604	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,604	0	0	0	0
Sacramento	loc		Power Inn Rd/RT grade sep (\$5625 loc)(SO)	4,000	4,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,000	0	0	0	0
Citrus Heights	loc		Widen Greenback, Dewey-SJ (\$1511)(SO)	3,397	634	2,763	0	0	0	0	620	2,541	14	222	0	0
Caltrans	80		HOV lanes, Longview Rd-Placer County	28,305	300	0	3,014	24,991	0	0	64	22,791	300	2,750	200	2,200
			<b>SUBTOTAL:</b>	<b>96,338</b>	<b>9,671</b>	<b>20,825</b>	<b>40,602</b>	<b>25,072</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>2,420</b>	<b>80,627</b>	<b>1,142</b>	<b>9,749</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>2,200</b>
<b>Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:</b>																
			Reserve for 2000 STIP	0												
			<b>SUBTOTAL:</b>	<b>96,338</b>												
			TEA/RSTP transfer	-6,365												
			<b>TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE</b>	<b>89,973</b>												
<b>TEA Restricted Share:</b>																
			TEA/RSTP transfer	6,365												
			<b>TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE</b>	<b>6,365</b>												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			For 3 projects to improve interchanges with State highways, Sacramento County is listed as sponsor and responsible agency. No Caltrans role apparent.													

## (\$1,000's)

California Transportation Commission Page 36 5/12/98



# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

San Bernardino																
			Total County Share	254,205												
			TEA Share	12,483												
			Unrestricted County Share	241,722												

## (\$1,000's)

5/12/98

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

San Francisco																
			Total County Share	55,932												
			TEA Share	4,113												
			Unrestricted County Share	51,819												
Project Totals by Fiscal Year											Project Totals by Component					
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
<b>Programmed Non-TEA County Share:</b>																
MTC			Planning, programming, and monitoring	279	47	46	47	46	47	46	0	279	0	0	0	0
MTC	loc		CMAQ match reserve	2,212	369	369	368	369	369	368	0	2,212	0	0	0	0
MTC	loc		Translink (automated fare equipment)(SO)	709	0	0	709	0	0	0	0	709	0	0	0	0
MTC	loc		TOS (repair, activate loop detectors)	158	158	0	0	0	0	0	0	158	0	0	0	0
MTC	loc		Regional rideshare program	1,768	242	267	293	307	322	337	0	1,768	0	0	0	0
SF Muni	rail		Muni ext, 3rd St to Caltrain Bayshore (SO)	25,000	0	0	0	0	13,946	11,054	0	25,000	0	0	0	0
SF Muni	rail		Rail Replacement Program	10,264	3,696	6,568	0	0	0	0	0	10,264	0	0	0	0
SF Muni	loc		Global Positioning System/Central Control	2,000	1,000	1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,000	0	0
SF Muni	loc		Islais Creek Motor Coach Facility	3,958	2,580	1,378	0	0	0	0	0	3,378	0	580	0	0
JPB Caltrain	rail		Centralized Control Sys & Track Improvs	2,500	2,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,250	0	250	0	0
BART	rail		Adv Automatic Train Control System	5,000	0	5,000	0	0	0	0	0	5,000	0	0	0	0
			SUBTOTAL:	53,848	10,592	14,628	1,417	722	14,684	11,805	0	51,018	0	2,830	0	0
<b>Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:</b>																
			Reserve for 2000 STIP	27												
			SUBTOTAL:	53,875												
			TEA/RSTP transfer	-2,056												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	51,819												
<b>TEA Restricted Share:</b>																
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	2,057												
			SUBTOTAL:	2,057												
			TEA/RSTP transfer	2,056												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	4,113												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			RTIP did not provide FY spreads for planning, programming, and monitoring, or for CMAQ match funds. They are spread here evenly.													
			For JPB Caltrain project, \$3,500 in JPB local funds/RSTP guarantee.													
			BART train control: other identified funding includes \$5,870 RSTP/CMAQ in FY 02 and \$5,000 BART funds in FY 02.													
			Muni 3rd Street extension: total cost \$456,705; other sources include \$7,600 CMAQ, \$988 CMAQ reserve (STIP), \$500 Prop 108 (prior STIP), \$422,618 local sales and other local fun													
			Muni Islais Creek Facility: total cost, \$35,746; other sources include \$13,934 Fed Sec 3/Sec 9; \$17,854 local sales tax and other local funds.													
			Muni GPS/Central Control project: total cost, \$33,734; other sources include \$5,000 Fed Sec 3; \$9,450 RSTP; \$17,285 local sales tax and other local funds.													
			Muni describes rail replacement as "annual recurring program." Funding plan includes past, present, and future STIP and non-STIP funding.													

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

San Joaquin																
			Total County Share	68,993												
			TEA Share	3,335												
			Unrestricted County Share	65,658												
				Project Totals by Fiscal Year						Project Totals by Component						
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
<b>Programmed Non-TEA County Share:</b>																
SJCOG			Planning, programming, and monitoring	345	58	57	58	57	58	57	0	345	0	0	0	0
SJCOG	loc		TDM ridesharing	951	150	153	157	160	164	167	0	951	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	205	7965B	Widen to 6 Ins, Rt 5-11th St (50% RTIP)	2,951	821	0	0	0	1,580	550	550	0	821	1,473	107	0
Caltrans	99	7664	Arch Road interchange	14,363	0	14,363	0	0	0	0	0	11,714	0	0	0	2,649
Caltrans	5	7284	Hammer Lane interchange	1,835	1,835	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,282	0	0	0	553
Caltrans	12	7350	Bouldin Island passing lanes	19,285	1,146	0	0	1,915	358	15,866	358	14,856	1,121	1,915	25	1,010
Caltrans	5	7266	Soundwall, NB Monte Diablo-Smith Canal	899	119	10	770	0	0	0	10	600	0	119	14	156
Caltrans	99	7680	Soundwall, NB Main St north	693	109	584	0	0	0	0	0	470	0	109	0	114
Caltrans	5	7278	Soundwall, NB 14 Mile Slough-Ben Holt	1,053	143	910	0	0	0	0	0	725	0	143	0	185
			SUBTOTAL:	42,375	4,381	16,077	985	2,132	2,160	16,640	918	30,943	1,942	3,759	146	4,667
<b>Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:</b>																
			Reserve for 2000 STIP: I-205	24,101												
			Reserve for 2000 STIP: proj dev	2,517												
			SUBTOTAL:	68,993												
			TEA/RSTP Trade	-3,335												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	65,658												
<b>TEA Restricted Share:</b>																
			TEA/RSTP transfer	3,335												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	3,335												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			RTIP pledges to use \$3,335 in RSTP funds for TEA projects.													
			Rt 205 project is also funded with \$2,952 from the ITIP. Estimated future costs to complete construction are \$48,201.													
			Rt 99 Arch Rd project is \$29,071, with \$5,068 from Measure K, \$476 RSTP, and \$9,164 other local funds.													
			Rt 5 Hammer Lane project is \$5,752, with \$1,889 RSTP, \$1,043 Measure K, \$935 SHOPP, and \$50 other.													
			For Arch Rd and Hammer Ln projects, RTIP lists Stockton as "lead agency" and "responsible agency, yet lists costs for Caltrans support.													

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

San Luis Obispo																	
			Total County Share	62,209													
			TEA Share	2,714													
			Unrestricted County Share	59,495													
						Project Totals by Fiscal Year						Project Totals by Component					
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng	
Programmed Non-TEA County Share:																	
SLOCOG	loc		Planning, programming, and monitoring	311	52	52	52	52	52	51	0	311	0	0	0	0	
SLOCOG	loc		TDM (rideshare)	951	140	147	154	162	170	178	0	951	0	0	0	0	
Caltrans	46	226A	Expressway, Airport Rd-Shandon (RTIP)	28,218	562	360	1,938	0	0	25,358	506	23,280	562	1,432	360	2,078	
Caltrans	101	3884	Pismo Beach frontage rd (loc \$1,135)	11,659	595	0	1,587	661	0	8,816	500	7,655	595	1,587	161	1,161	
Caltrans	41	4028	Route 41/101 Interchange, Atascadero	8,979	409	1,099	1,464	0	6,007	0	1,099	4,986	409	1,182	282	1,021	
Paso Robles	loc		Niblick Bridge, Paso Robles	5,500	5,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,500	0	0	0	0	
Paso Robles	loc		Paso Robles station improvements	100	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	
Caltrans	rail		Centralized traffic control point	100	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	
SLORTA	loc		SCAT bus rehab, Phase 2 (50% loc)	100	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	
SLOCOG	loc		Short-term reserve: transit/rail	600	600	0	0	0	0	0	0	600	0	0	0	0	
Caltrans	41	3453	Rt 41 W. passing lanes, MB-Atascadero	2,568	203	0	212	331	0	1,822	255	1,554	203	212	76	268	
			SUBTOTAL:	59,086	8,261	1,758	5,407	1,206	6,229	36,225	2,360	45,137	1,769	4,413	879	4,528	
Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:																	
			Reserve for 2000 STIP: transit/rail	400													
			SUBTOTAL:	59,486													
			Unidentified	9													
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	59,495													
TEA Restricted Share:																	
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	2,714													
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	2,714													
Notes:																	
			Rt 46 project funding also includes \$32,946 from the ITIP.														
			Niblick Bridge funding also includes \$4,220 City funds and \$1,500 Federal demo funds from 1987 Act. \$970 in demo funds already expended on project development.														
			Centralized traffic control project also funded from \$1,000 in Caltrans rail program in the ITIP.														
			Did not include project component breakdown by FY. Figures here estimated from fact sheets.														
			RTIP identified a single \$1,000 transit/rail reserve "over 5 yrs" without identifying the FY's or recognizing the difference between short term reserves and reserves for 2000 STIP.														
			By letter of April 11, SLOCOG staff recommended \$600 in FY 99, \$400 as reserve for 2000 STIP.														
			RTIP used Draft Fund Estimate rather than Final Fund Estimate; hence \$9 not identified for programming.														

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

San Mateo																
			Total County Share	56,539												
			TEA Share	4,158												
			Unrestricted County Share	52,381												
				Project Totals by Fiscal Year						Project Totals by Component						
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
<b>Programmed Non-TEA County Share:</b>																
MTC			Planning, programming, and monitoring	282	47	47	47	47	47	47	0	282	0	0	0	0
MTC	loc		CMAQ match reserve	1,993	332	332	332	333	332	332	0	1,993	0	0	0	0
MTC	loc		Translink (automated fare equipment)(SO)	639	0	0	639	0	0	0	0	639	0	0	0	0
MTC	loc		TOS (repair, activate loop detectors)	135	135	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	0	0	0	0
JPB Caltrain	rail		Centralized Control Sys & Track Improvs	4,981	1,472	3,509	0	0	0	0	0	4,831	0	150	0	0
Caltrans	92		Slow vehicle lane improvements (incr)	13,771	0	13,771	0	0	0	0	0	10,910	0	1,000	122	1,739
Caltrans	101		Auxilliary lanes, Rt 92 to Marsh Rd	25,961	1,594	1,003	18,684	4,680	0	0	167	18,684	1,594	836	4,680	0
BART	rail		Adv Automatic Train Control System	4,170	0	4,170	0	0	0	0	0	4,170	0	0	0	0
			SUBTOTAL:	51,932	3,580	22,832	19,702	5,060	379	379	167	41,644	1,594	1,986	4,802	1,739
<b>Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:</b>																
			Reserve for 2000 STIP: Devil's Slide tunnel	2,500												
			Reserve for 2000 STIP	28												
			SUBTOTAL:	54,460												
			TEA/RSTP transfer	-2,079												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	52,381												
<b>TEA Restricted Share:</b>																
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	2,079												
			SUBTOTAL:	2,079												
			TEA/RSTP transfer	2,079												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	4,158												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			RTIP did not provide FY spreads for planning, programming, and monitoring, or for CMAQ match funds. They are spread here evenly.													
			For JPB Caltrain project, \$1,250 in JPB local funds/RSTP guarantee.													
			Rt 92 project augments 1996 STIP funding, \$5,124 for R/W + construction.													
			For Rt 101 project, RTIP lists County Transportation Authority as "sponsor" in summary and City of San Carlos as "responsible agency" on fact sheet.													
			MTC letter identifies Caltrans as responsible for environmental and R/W acquisition.													
			MTC letter identifies Caltrans as responsible for construction administration, yet RTIP programs nothing for construction engineering.													
			ITIP includes an additional \$2,500 as a reserve for Devil's Slide tunnel.													

## (\$1,000's)

5/12/98

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Santa Clara																
					</											



# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	Project Totals by Fiscal Year						Project Totals by Component					
					FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Santa Cruz																
			Total County Share	26,220												
			TEA Share	1,589												
			Unrestricted County Share	24,631												
Project Totals by Fiscal Year											Project Totals by Component					
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
<b>Programmed Non-TEA County Share:</b>																
SCCRTC			Planning, programming, and monitoring	456	76	76	76	76	76	76	0	456	0	0	0	0
SCCRTC			Rideshare Program	699	0	67	153	156	160	163	0	699	0	0	0	0
SCCRTC			Highway 1 Freeway Service Patrol	363	0	70	71	72	74	76	0	363	0	0	0	0
SCMTD	loc		Consolidated Bus Operations Facility	6,000	0	6,000	0	0	0	0	0	6,000	0	0	0	0
Santa Cruz	loc		Multimodal Station (Phase 1)(loc \$2600)	2,100	2,100	0	0	0	0	0	2,100	0	0	0	0	0
Santa Cruz	loc		River St improves (Phase B & C)(loc \$800)	1,800	0	1,800	0	0	0	0	0	1,800	0	0	0	0
Santa Cruz	loc		San Lorenzo River Bike/Ped Bridge	800	0	0	800	0	0	0	0	690	10	100	0	0
Santa Cruz Co	loc		Capitola Road widening (loc \$3010)	3,090	0	3,090	0	0	0	0	0	3,090	0	0	0	0
Santa Cruz Co	loc		Graham Hill Rd improvements (loc \$200)	1,000	175	825	0	0	0	0	60	825	15	100	0	0
Caltrans	17		Truck climbing lane (RTIP)	2,000	0	0	0	0	0	2,000	0	2,000	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	1		Harkins Slough interchange (loc \$2523)	5,635	0	0	0	132	5,503	0	132	5,503	0	0	0	0
SCMTD	loc		ADA paratransit bus replacements (loc \$30)	230	230	0	0	0	0	0	0	230	0	0	0	0
SCCRTC	loc		Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line	450	450	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	450	0	0	0
			SUBTOTAL:	24,623	3,031	11,928	1,100	436	5,813	2,315	2,292	21,656	475	200	0	0
<b>Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:</b>																
			Reserve for 2000 STIP	0												
			SUBTOTAL:	24,623												
			Unidentified	8												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	24,631												
<b>TEA Restricted Share:</b>																
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	1,589												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	1,589												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			Requested State only for rideshare program and freeway service patrol.													
			Did not include project component breakdown by FY. Figures here estimated from fact sheets.													
			For Consolidated Transportation Facility, other sources include \$6660 Fed Sec 5309 & 5307 and \$18,3312 local.													
			For Harkins Slough project, RTIP lists Watsonville as "responsible agency", though on State highway system. Lists Caltrans support costs.													
			Rt 17 truck climbing lane joint funded with ITIP. ITIP includes balance of \$7,269.													
			For Santa Cruz Branch Line, RTIP identifies full funding program.													
			Capital costs of \$10,600 from Prop 116 plus unknown cost of operating rights.													
			Annual operating expenditures of \$988: \$388 fares, \$178 local, \$222 region, \$200 State.													
			RTIP used Draft Fund Estimate rather than Final Fund Estimate; hence \$8 not identified for programming.													
			Updated for April 29 letter regarding Harkins Slough.													

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Shasta																
			Total County Share	34,999												
			TEA Share	1,602												
			Unrestricted County Share	33,397												
				Project Totals by Fiscal Year						Project Totals by Component						
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
<b>Programmed Non-TEA County Share:</b>																
Shasta RTPA			Planning, programming, and monitoring	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shasta Lake	loc	2034	Pine Grove Av extension	3,501	3,501	0	0	0	0	0	261	2,953	41	246	0	0
Shasta County	loc	2035	Knighton Rd extension	8,712	256	919	7,537	0	0	0	446	7,537	256	473	0	0
Redding	loc	2036	Parkview Bridge across Sacramento River	156	156	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	156	0	0	0
Redding	loc	6651	Downtown Redding Rt 299 & 273 improves	237	237	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	237	0	0	0
Redding	loc	2037	Cypress Relief: widen Sac River Bridge	2,152	252	1,900	0	0	0	0	0	1,900	10	242	0	0
Redding	loc	2038	Cypress Relief: widen bridge approaches	2,327	2,327	0	0	0	0	0	307	1,778	10	232	0	0
Anderson	loc	2039	Balls Ferry off ramp, I-5 (loc \$172)	1,275	1,275	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,275	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	5	6055	NB auxiliary lane, Rt 44 to Hilltop OC	4,723	551	4,172	0	0	0	0	0	3,633	58	493	25	514
Shasta RTPA	loc		Short term reserve	7,059	2,850	4,209	0	0	0	0	0	7,059	0	0	0	0
			SUBTOTAL:	30,142	11,405	11,200	7,537	0	0	0	1,014	26,135	768	1,686	25	514
<b>Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:</b>																
			Reserve for 2000 STIP	3,255												
			SUBTOTAL:	33,397												
			Unidentified	0												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	33,397												
<b>TEA Restricted Share:</b>																
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	1,602												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	1,602												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			State only funds requested for Pine Grove project, to match EDA grant of \$1,500.													
			State only funds requested for Cypress Sacramento Bridge project, to match \$12,500 HBRR.													
			Updated per Shasta RTPA letter of April 13.													

## (\$1,000's)

California Transportation Commission Page 48 5/12/98

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Siskiyou																
			Total County Share	21,708												
			TEA Share	1,117												
			Unrestricted County Share	20,591												
				Project Totals by Fiscal Year						Project Totals by Component						
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
<b>Programmed Non-TEA County Share:</b>																
Siskiyou LTC			Planning, programming, and monitoring	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montague	loc	2030	11th St reconstruction	682	682	0	0	0	0	0	0	623	0	59	0	0
Caltrans	97	244A	Dorris Expressway (RTIP 50%)	9,435	183	0	0	1,361	0	7,891	463	7,145	183	626	272	746
Siskiyou County	loc	2031	Co Rd A-12, Grenada-Rt 97, reconstruction	8,045	460	7,585	0	0	0	0	100	7,585	60	300	0	0
			SUBTOTAL:	18,162	1,325	7,585	0	1,361	0	7,891	563	15,353	243	985	272	746
<b>Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:</b>																
			Reserve for 2000 STIP	2,429												
			SUBTOTAL:	20,591												
			Unidentified	0												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	20,591												
<b>TEA Restricted Share:</b>																
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	1,117												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	1,117												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			Did not include project component breakdown by FY. Figures here estimated from fact sheets.													
			Dorris Expressway project also funded with \$9,435 from ITIP.													

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Solano																
			Total County Share	31,149												
			TEA Share	2,291												
			Unrestricted County Share	28,858												
															</	

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Sonoma																
			Total County Share	57,604												
			TEA Share	2,768												
			Unrestricted County Share	54,836												
															</	

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Stanislaus																
			Total County Share	54,992												
			TEA Share	2,517												
			Unrestricted County Share	52,475												
Project Totals by Fiscal Year											Project Totals by Component					
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
<b>Programmed Non-TEA County Share:</b>																
SAAG			Planning, programming, and monitoring	275	46	46	46	46	46	45	0	275	0	0	0	0
SAAG	loc		RSTP/CMAQ match reserve	1,200	200	200	200	200	200	200	0	1,200	0	0	0	0
SAAG	loc		Rideshare program	415	100	103	105	107	0	0	0	415	0	0	0	0
SAAG	loc		Short term reserve: TCI	400	200	200	0	0	0	0	0	400	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	132	944M	Expressway (Stg 1), Rt 99-Morse/Nebraska	10,000	1,572	0	3,399	5,029	0	0	5,029	0	1,572	2,888	511	0
Caltrans	219	9940	Expressway, Rt 99-McHenry	7,927	1,002	0	2,925	0	0	4,000	4,000	0	1,002	1,303	1,622	0
			SUBTOTAL:	20,217	3,120	549	6,675	5,382	246	4,245	9,029	2,290	2,574	4,191	2,133	0
<b>Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:</b>																
			Reserve for 2000 STIP	4,542												
			Loan Transfer to MTC for Marin County	10,000												
			Long Term Reserve, 2002 STIP	17,716												
			SUBTOTAL:	52,475												
			Unidentified	0												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	52,475												
<b>TEA Restricted Share:</b>																
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	2,517												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	2,517												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			SAAG is loaning long term reserve of \$10,000 to MTC, with return of \$11,800 in next county share period.													
			Estimated future costs to construct Rt 132 Expressway (Stage 1) are \$35,243, with construction in FY 05.													
			Estimated future costs to construct Rt 219 Expressway (Kiernan Av) are \$12,617, with construction in FY 05.													
			The reserve for the 2000 STIP is "intended to be used for the cost of relinquishing Route 108 if Modesto, County, and Caltrans reach agreement."													



# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Sutter																
			Total County Share	9,050												
			TEA Share	568												
			Unrestricted County Share	8,482												
Project Totals by Fiscal Year											Project Totals by Component					
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
<b>Programmed Non-TEA County Share:</b>																
SACOG			Planning, programming, and monitoring	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	99		Widen to 4 lanes, Central-Ashford (RTIP)	8,471	1,083	0	0	7,388	0	0	1,041	6,615	0	0	42	773
			SUBTOTAL:	8,471	1,083	0	0	7,388	0	0	1,041	6,615	0	0	42	773
<b>Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:</b>																
			Reserve for 2000 STIP	11												
			SUBTOTAL:	8,482												
			Unidentified	0												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	8,482												
<b>TEA Restricted Share:</b>																
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	568												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	568												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			Rt 99 project also funded with \$1,424 from ITIP.													
			The ITIP also includes 5 other projects in Sutter County, including 3 other Rt 99 projects.													
			The other Rt 99 ITIP projects total \$28,670.													
			The two other projects, on Rt 70, total \$47,640.													
			Updated for April 16 amendment.													

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Tahoe RPA																
			Total County Share	8,266												
			TEA Share	378												
			Unrestricted County Share	7,888												
				Project Totals by Fiscal Year						Project Totals by Component						
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
<b>Programmed Non-TEA County Share:</b>																
Tahoe RPA			Planning, programming, and monitoring	165	83	82	0	0	0	0	0	165	0	0	0	0
Tahoe RPA	loc		Transit vehicle purchase (4 veh)(loc \$140)	560	560	0	0	0	0	0	0	560	0	0	0	0
So Lake Tahoe	loc		Hwy 50 curb, gutter, sidewalk (loc \$650)	2,146	215	917	0	1,014	0	0	514	0	215	917	0	500
Placer County	loc		Tahoe City SR 28 improvements (loc \$625)	1,373	1,373	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,373	0	0	0	0
			SUBTOTAL:	4,244	2,231	999	0	1,014	0	0	514	2,098	215	917	0	500
<b>Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:</b>																
			Reserve for 2000 STIP	3,644												
			SUBTOTAL:	7,888												
			Unidentified	0												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	7,888												
<b>TEA Restricted Share:</b>																
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	378												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	378												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			Tahoe City improvements include:													
			Resurfacing & restriping to provide bike lanes and parallel parking.													
			Two off street parking lots.													
			Sidewalk streetscape improvements.													
			Other sources of funding listed for Tahoe City project include \$400 NLTRA, \$225 assessments, and \$1,255 1990 STIP.													
			RTIP did not provide FY spread for planning, programming, and monitoring. At suggestion of TRPA staff, they are spread here across first 2 years.													
			Updated April 27.													

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Tehama																
			Total County Share	12,444												
			TEA Share	793												
			Unrestricted County Share	11,651												
				Project Totals by Fiscal Year						Project Totals by Component						
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
<b>Programmed Non-TEA County Share:</b>																
			Planning, programming, and monitoring	249	42	41	42	41	42	41	0	249	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	5	266C	Adobe Rd, construct last 2 ramps	2,170	0	70	2,100	0	0	0	0	2,035	0	70	0	65
Tehama County	loc	2032	Flores Av Access Rd, 2.5 mi (loc \$1,144)	3,941	0	3,941	0	0	0	0	0	3,941	0	0	0	0
Tehama County	loc		Short term reserve: HBRR match (SO)	1,300	0	1,300	0	0	0	0	0	1,300	0	0	0	0
			SUBTOTAL:	7,660	42	4,052	2,142	41	42	41	0	6,225	0	70	0	65
<b>Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:</b>																
			Reserve for 2000 STIP	3,991												
			SUBTOTAL:	11,651												
			Unidentified	0												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	11,651												
<b>TEA Restricted Share:</b>																
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	793												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	793												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			Did not provide spread for planning, programming, and monitoring. Figures here spread evenly.													
			Did not include project component breakdown by FY. Figures here estimated from fact sheets.													
			Did not include FY spread for HBRR match reserve. This is assumed to be short term reserve in 2nd year.													
			Identifies reserve "to be programmed in the future" without designating whether reserve for 2000 STIP or long term reserve. Assumed to be reserve for 2000 STIP.													
			RTIP identifies State only for HBRR reserves.													

## (\$1,000's)

California Transportation Commission

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Tulare																
			Total County Share	57,867												
			TEA Share	3,127												
			Unrestricted County Share	54,740												
				Project Totals by Fiscal Year						Project Totals by Component						
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
<b>Programmed Non-TEA County Share:</b>																
TCAG			Planning, programming, and monitoring	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	63	6220	Widen to 6 lanes, Packwood Crk-Rt 198	1,662	662	0	0	1,000	0	0	0	0	662	1,000	0	0
Caltrans	65	3478	Passing lanes, Kern Co-Rt 190	1,004	442	0	0	562	0	0	0	0	442	562	0	0
Tulare County	loc	???	Rd 80 expressway, Goshen-El Monte Way	5,790	968	3,175	1,518	129	0	0	0	0	1,988	3,802	0	0
Tulare City	loc	???	Rt 99/Prosperity Av interch mods	465	167	298	0	0	0	0	0	0	155	310	0	0
			SUBTOTAL:	8,921	2,239	3,473	1,518	1,691	0	0	0	0	3,247	5,674	0	0
<b>Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:</b>																
			Reserve for 2000 STIP	45,819												
			SUBTOTAL:	54,740												
			Unidentified	0												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	54,740												
<b>TEA Restricted Share:</b>																
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	3,127												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	3,127												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			Assumed Kings/Tulare-198 would be in ITIP. It is not.													
			No projects scheduled for construction. No projects have local contributions.													
			Estimated additional costs for R/W and construction (including support) for all projects is \$67,114.													
			According to fact sheets, all 4 projects are deliverable within STIP period; all except Rd 80 expressway are fully fundable within the period.													

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Tuolumne																
			Total County Share	8,905												
			TEA Share	655												
			Unrestricted County Share	8,250												
				Project Totals by Fiscal Year						Project Totals by Component						
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
<b>Programmed Non-TEA County Share:</b>																
TCCAPC			Planning, programming, and monitoring	178	29	30	29	30	30	30	0	178	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	108	21C	Hess Avenue interchange, Sonora Bypass	7,069	493	0	6,576	0	0	0	0	6,138	5	488	0	438
Tuolumne Co	loc		Jamestown Bridge Replace (HBRR match)	159	0	159	0	0	0	0	0	159	0	0	0	0
TCCAPC	loc		Short term reserve (State only)	523	0	523	0	0	0	0	0	523	0	0	0	0
			SUBTOTAL:	7,929	522	712	6,605	30	30	30	0	6,998	5	488	0	438
<b>Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:</b>																
			Reserve for 2000 STIP	321												
			SUBTOTAL:	8,250												
			Unidentified	0												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	8,250												
<b>TEA Restricted Share:</b>																
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	655												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	655												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			RTIP did not include FY spread for planning, programming, and monitoring. It is spread here evenly.													
			RTIP identifies \$159 "programmed as RSTP local match" without identifying individual projects.													
			TCCAPC staff letter of April 21 identifies as Jamestown Bridge Replacement; scheduled for programming at May 28 meeting.													
			RTIP identifies as short term reserves the amount of cost savings from an earlier Caltrans estimate for the Hess Av interchange.													
			RTIP identifies remaining funds as "reserved for future programming." This is treated here as a reserve for the 2000 STIP.													

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Ventura																
			Total County Share	85,982												
			TEA Share	4,565												
			Unrestricted County Share	81,417												
					Project Totals by Fiscal Year						Project Totals by Component					
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
Programmed Non-TEA County Share:																
SBCAG			Planning, programming, and monitoring	1,393	232	232	232	232	232	233	0	1,393	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	118	1231S	Hwy 118/23 Connector landscaping	1,244	1,244	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,006	0	70	3	165
Caltrans	118	1238J	Widening, Tapo Cyn to Co Line	40,312	4,477	41	0	0	0	35,794	0	32,077	982	3,495	41	3,717
Caltrans	23	1167B	Widening SB & NB, Rt 118 to Rt 101	39,009	313	3,973	0	0	0	34,723	140	31,025	313	2,958	875	3,698
VCTC	rail		Montalvo Wye upgrade & rail rehab	500	500	0	0	0	0	0	0	500	0	0	0	0
Santa Paula	loc		Santa Paula station R/W (50% loc)	200	200	0	0	0	0	0	200	0	0	0	0	0
Ventura	loc		Johnson Dr grade separation (loc \$7,353)	500	500	0	0	0	0	0	0	500	0	0	0	0
VCTC	rail		Montalvo Wye power switches	1,005	1,005	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,005	0	0	0	0
VCTC	rail		Glendale Slide freight siding (loc \$520)	678	678	0	0	0	0	0	0	678	0	0	0	0
VCTC	loc		Short term reserve: TCI-type projects	5,817	5,817	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,817	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	126	1246D	Victoria Av soundwall, westbound	2,690	51	0	0	236	3	2,400	0	2,108	51	236	3	292
Caltrans	101	1205T	Rt 34 (Lewis Rd) interchange (cost incr)	3,029	0	3,029	0	0	0	0	0	3,029	0	0	0	0
			SUBTOTAL:	96,377	15,017	7,275	232	468	235	73,150	340	79,138	1,346	6,759	922	7,872
Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:																
			Requested advance: Route 23	-14,960												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	81,417												
TEA Restricted Share:																
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	4,565												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	4,565												
Notes:																
			For Rt 23 widening project, costs include project development and R/W for both sides; construction for Southbound only. Construction for Northbound is additional \$14,976.													
			Santa Paula station and Montalvo Wye are on Santa Paula Branch Line, for which future service is proposed.													
			"The Glendale Slide" is on the Coast Main Line in Glendale (LA County); project would install siding .													
			For Lewis Rd interchange, total escalated cost is \$32,390, with \$29,361 from 96 STIP.													
			RTIP used Draft Fund Estimate rather than Final Fund Estimate; hence \$16 not identified for programming.													

# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Yolo																
			<b>Total County Share</b>	<b>18,774</b>												
			<b>TEA Share</b>	<b>1,233</b>												
			<b>Unrestricted County Share</b>	<b>17,541</b>												
Project Totals by Fiscal Year											Project Totals by Component					
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
<b>Programmed Non-TEA County Share:</b>																
SACOG			Planning, programming, and monitoring	94	15	15	15	16	16	17	0	94	0	0	0	0
West Sac'to	loc		Enterprise Bl, modify I-80 interch (\$1300 loc)	10,064	24	1,128	2,669	5,530	564	149	3,669	6,183	8	204	0	0
West Sac'to	loc		Harbor Bl, modify Rt 50/80 interch (\$500 loc)	800	0	800	0	0	0	0	0	0	350	450	0	0
Woodland	loc		I-5/Rt 113 fwy/fwy connector (loc \$669)	6,016	5	6,011	0	0	0	0	4,547	864	5	600	0	0
Yolo County	loc		Replace 2 bridges, CR 22,CR 99W (\$2109)	527	421	106	0	0	0	0	0	458	4	65	0	0
			SUBTOTAL:	17,501	465	8,060	2,684	5,546	580	166	8,216	7,599	367	1,319	0	0
<b>Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:</b>																
			Reserve for 2000 STIP	40												
			SUBTOTAL:	17,541												
			Unidentified	0												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	17,541												
<b>TEA Restricted Share:</b>																
Yolo County	loc		CR 32 widening, bike lanes	300	300	0	0	0	0	0	0	296	0	4	0	0
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	933												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	1,233												
<b>Notes:</b>																
			For 2 projects to improve interchanges with State highways, City of West Sacramento is listed as sponsor and responsible agency. No Caltrans role apparent.													
			For freeway to freeway connector project, City of Woodland is listed as sponsor and responsible agency. No Caltrans role apparent.													
			Updated for April 16 amendment.													



# SUMMARY OF 1998 RTIP PROJECTS

(\$1,000's)

Yuba																
			Total County Share	6,604												
			TEA Share	486												
			Unrestricted County Share	6,118												
						Project Totals by Fiscal Year						Project Totals by Component				
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Eng	Con Eng
Programmed Non-TEA County Share:																
SACOG			Planning, programming, and monitoring	33	5	5	5	6	6	6	0	33	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	65	362A	Third River Bridge (RTIP)	4,500	828	0	3,230	0	0	442	0	0	828	3,230	442	0
SACOG	loc		Short term reserve	1,385	0	1,385	0	0	0	0	0	1,385	0	0	0	0
			SUBTOTAL:	5,918	833	1,390	3,235	6	6	448	0	1,418	828	3,230	442	0
Unprogrammed, Non-TEA county share:																
SACOG			Reserve for 2000 STIP: Marysville station	200												
			SUBTOTAL:	6,118												
			Unidentified	0												
			TOTAL NON-TEA COUNTY SHARE	6,118												
TEA Restricted Share:																
			TEA Reserve Unprogrammed	486												
			TOTAL TEA-RESTRICTED SHARE	486												
Notes:																
			Rt 65 Third River Bridge project also funded with \$1,746 from ITIP.													
			ITIP estimates future costs to construction for Third River Bridge project at \$177,782.													
			Short term reserve is listed in RTIP as "uncommitted short term reserve," with no listed FY.													